THE STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE OF SECOND THESSALONIANS

A thesis presented

by

Robert John Peterson

to

The Faculty of the Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

in the subject of

New Testament Studies

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

November 1967

Summary

THE STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE OF SECOND THESSALONIANS

by

Robert John Peterson

Who is the author of II Thess? This question has been a major problem in the study of this epistle since the turn of the 19th century. It has been standard practice for commentators first, to take up the authorship question, survey the evidence and then, take a position from which the exegesis of the epistle is conducted.

The great weakness in attempting to solve the authorship problem first, is that we are tempted to formulate a working hypothesis and proceed to justify it in the exegesis. The purpose of this study is to investigate the structure of II Thess. by comparing it with the Pauline letter style, with the letter style of I Thess., and with the literary affinities I Thess. has with II Thess. Further, this study examines the purpose of II Thess. and sets this purpose out against the background of the developing apocalyptic tradition in the early church. The problem of τὸ κατέχον - ὁ κατέχων in II Thess. 2 brings the purpose of the epistle into sharp focus.

By setting aside the authorship question, and investigating the structure and purpose of this epistle one can proceed with the exegesis without first having to solve the authorship question.

The great difference between I and II Thess. is that while II Thess. is less than half the length of I Thess. it has the same basic epistolary outline, and thus appears to be a letter of more form than content. The epistolary structure of II Thess. is taken from I Thess. but with some basic differences. (1) The prayer forms in II Thess. do not fit the content in the same way they do in I Thess. (2) II Thess. has a peculiar salutation, parallel with I Thess. but combining Pauline elements in a non-Pauline manner. (3) II Thess. has eschatological instruction in the first part of the epistle. This never occurs in the other Pauline epistles. (4) The epistolary framework of II Thess. is cumbersome with regard to its content and length, while the epistolary framework of I Thess. harmonizes well with the content.

II Thess. has a great number of literary affinities with I Thess. which tie the two epistles closer together than common authorship would allow. These literary relationships occur in profusion at the very points where the epistolary framework is dealt with, eg. prayers, benedictions, and transitions. The very points at which II Thess. departs from the epistolary outline of I Thess. are the points at which this peculiar parallelism stops, i,e, II Thess. 1:6-10, 2:2-4,6-12. These are also the sections which seem to depart most radically from the normal Pauline epistolary outline. These particular sections are related in an intimate fashion with Matt, 24 and Didache 16. The use of specific words, images, and allusions to the apocalypse of Daniel show that II Thess. 1:6-10 and 2;1-12 are parts of a fairly well defined early Christian

teaching on the last things. This is not to say that there was a common source, written or memorized, which they all followed, but it is to say that there was a common tradition in terms of certain words, images, and apocalyptic setting which informed all these writings.

The author of II Thess. be he Paul or someone else, used two sources for this epistle. From I Thess. he took the epistolary outline, which he fitted around selections from this early Christian apocalyptic tradition.

The focus of the epistle comes in the second chapter. The author sets out to counter the idea that the Day of the Lord is dawning. The situation pictured in the epistle is that of an agitated community. Some, at least, have set aside the normal routines of life, for they were convinced that they were already caught up in the events of the end time. The Day of the Lord was dawning, and Jesus would soon be here. It was inevitable. It is against this belief that the epistle is directed. Not everyone in the church is pictured as being so aroused, and there is no hint as to the cause of this disruption.

The pivot point for determining the purpose of the epistle is the exact meaning of the word, ἐνέστηκεν. The precise meaning in II Thess. 2:2 lies between our word imminent and the concept of being present. It does not mean that the Day will come soon, or that the fulness of the Day is already here. Probably the best translation is, "The Day of the Lord is dawning."

Now to counter this idea, the author goes to the early Christian teaching on the last things. From it he shows that the Day of the Lord could not possibly be dawning, for the items which were to preceed it have not yet come forward. Specifically, the Man of Lawlessness has not come upon the scene.

The purpose of the author is to cool off apocalyptic enthusiasm and return the community to more normal activities. He argues on the basis of apocalypticism to apocalyptists that their enthusiasm is misdirected, because certain necessary elements in the end time process have not yet taken place.

In II Thess. the Man of Lawlessness functions in a similar manner to the Abomination of Desolation in Matt. 24, and the Cosmic Deceiver in Didache 16. In all three places, this end time symbol of deception and evil is the necessary prelude to the coming of the Son of Man/Lord Jesus.

Our author not only challenges his readers to recognize that the Man of Lawlessness has not yet appeared, but he goes on to indicate why. This harbinger of cosmic evil is being restrained by God himself, ὁ κατέχων on the basis of God's immutable decree, τὸ κατέχον It is one of God's mysteries, ן ן, in the predestined course of this world.

From this apocalyptic proof the author appeals to his readers to go back to work, to live quietly, for God's plan is working itself out with inexorable precision.

The fascinating thing about this apocalyptic material is the way the author uses it in reverse. Normally, apocalyptic imagery and argument is used to urge on the faithful to greater

deeds of faithfulness, resistance, belief, etc. Yet here the same images and arguments are used to play dowm enthusiasm. Instead of attempting to give the reader hope, the purpose of II Thess. is to curb an apocalyptic hope which has assured itself of present realization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	A SURVEY OF THE ARGUMENT CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF II THESSALONIANS	1
II	A COMPARISON OF THE EPISTOLARY STRUCTURE AND OUTLINE OF FIRST AND SECOND THESSALONIANS.	17
III	THE LITERARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND THESSALONIANS	48
IV	AN ANALYSIS OF THE APOCALYPTIC MATERIAL IN II THESSALONIANS	72
V	ΤΟ ΚΑΤΕΧΟΝ - Ο ΚΑΤΕΧΩΝ	109
VI	CONCLUSIONS	139
	ABBREVIATIONS	150
	BIBLIOGRAPHIES	152

CHAPTER I

A SURVEY OF THE ARGUMENT CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF II THESSALONIANS

Who is the author of II Thess.? This question has been a major problem in the study of this epistle since J. E. C. Schmidt[1] first questioned the authenticity of the eschatological section, II Thess. 2:1-12, at the turn of the 19th century. The pattern of most commentators on II Thess. has been to take up the authorship question, to survey the problems involved, and then assume a position on the subject. From this position then, the exegesis of the epistle is begun.[2]

The external evidence for the existance of the epistle is inconclusive until we come to about the middle of the second century. Didache 16[3] shows some apocalyptic images which are also reflected in II Thess., but these images are

---

1 J. E. C. Schmidt, "Vermutungen über die beiden Briefe an die Thess.," Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese des Neues Test. II 3 (1801), pp. 380-386.

2 For example, J. E. Frame, Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (1912), p. 53, ". . . the hypothesis of genuineness may be assumed as the best working hypothesis in spite of the difficulties suggested by the literary resemblances, especially the striking agreement in the epistolary outline."

3 Cf. infra p.89 for a discussion of the relationship between Didache 16 and II Thess.

not a sign of dependance. There are two phrases in Ignatius which resemble phrases in II Thess. II Thess. 3:5 ἐν ὑπομονῇ Χριστοῦ - Ign. Rom. 10:3 ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and II Thess. 2:3 μή τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ - Ign. Eph. 8:1 μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατάτω[1] As Rigaux observes, even though Ignatius may be woven full of Pauline allusions and phrases, this evidence does not establish the existence of II Thess. in Ignatius. These phrases are just not specific enough.

In Polycarp Phil. 11:3 there is an interesting reference which is probably the first direct evidence we have for the existance of II Thess. Polycarp writes, ". . . among whom the blessed Paul laboured, who are praised in the beginning of his epistle. For concerning you he boasts in all the churches."[2] Wrede[3] accepts this as a genuine reference to II Thess. 1:4 in spite of the fact that Polycarp's letter is addressed to the Philippians.[4] The phrase itself may just be a chance occurance. The difficulty is that if we allow a lapse of memory to cover the wrong address, we reinforce the possibility that Polycarp is writing nothing

---

1 B. Rigaux, Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens (1956), p. 116.

2 ". . . in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistulae eius. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis," K. Lake (ed. and tr.) The Apostolic Fathers (1959), ad loc.

3 W. Wrede, Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs (1903), pp. 93-94.

4 Rigaux, p. 117, "On peut admettre que, par lapsus de mémoire, Polycarp a attribué aux Philippiens ce que l' apôtre avait dit des Thessaloniciens."

more than a common tradition. This becomes even more possible if we postulate that II Thess. is pseudonymous. Nevertheless this is the first piece of evidence from external sources for the existance of II Thess.[1] If we follow Harrison in his analysis of Polycarp's epistle the earliest date for II Thess. by external evidence is 135-137 A.D.[2]

Justin Martyr[3] refers to the man of lawlessness, cf. II Thess. 2:3-4, but again this only proves a common tradition at the most. John Knox in his work on Marcion[4] shows that even though I and II Thess. were present under one title, Marcion knew both letters. Canon Muratori is explicit in mentioning two Thessalonian letters.[5] From this time on the evidence is abundant and clear for II Thess. So on the basis of external evidence all we can conclude is that II Thess. must have been written somewhere before the middle of the second century.

Hugo Grotius[6] seems to be the first writer who felt a tension between I and II Thess. II Thess. was seen as a

---

1 P.N. Harrison, Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians (1936), passim.

2 Ibid., p. 315.

3 Dial., 110:2, 32:4.

4 John Knox, Marcion and the New Testament (1942) pp. 44-45.

5 Reproduced in, D. Theron, Evidence of Tradition (1957), pp. 106-112.

6 H. Grotius, Annotationes in Novum Testamentum (I; Amsterdam, 1641),pp. 1032-42; (II; Paris, 1646), 651, as cited in T. W. Manson, "St. Paul in Greece," BJRL 35 (1952-53), p. 436.

letter Paul sent with Timothy, after they left Thessalonica, cf. I Thess. 3:1ff. This same position has had advocates since the time of Grotius, such as J.C. West,[1] Johannes Weiss,[2] and T. W. Manson.[4]

The development of the case for the inauthenticity of II Thess. is long and complicated,[3] but the arguments have turned around three main points: (1) the divergent views of eschatology contained in the two epistles, (2) the literary parallels between the two epistles, and (3) the difference in tone or warmth from one epistle to the other.

Schmidt began questioning the Pauline authorship because of the seeming contradiction in eschatological teaching between the two epistles. Basically this argument contends that I Thess. 5:2 spells out the belief that "the Day of the Lord" will come as a thief in the night, while II Thess. 2:3ff. specifically says that "the Man of Law -

---

1 J. C. West, "The Order of I and II Thess.," JTS 15 (1914), pp. 66-74.

2 J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum (1914), pp. 213-23.

3 W. Bornemann, Die Thessalonicherbriefe (1894), pp. 318-460 gives a most detailed history of the exegesis of the Thessalonian correspondence as well as the crucial passage II Thess. 2:1-12. Rigaux, pp. 124-47, sketches the exegesis and brings the argument down to the present. See also, Charles Masson, Les deux épîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens (1957), pp. 9-13, and Leon Morris, The First and Second Epistles of the Thessalonians (1959), pp. 29-34.

4 T. W. Manson, pp. 428-47.

lessness" must come first. The point made is that Paul could not hold to both ideas at one time. Either "the Day of the Lord" comes secretly, or it is announced with signs, but not both.

This argument has been tested and refined in many ways. Kern[1] looked for the interpretation of the epistle in the situation of the author and found that the heart of the epistle, II Thess. 2:1-12, was an application by a Paulinist of the Nero Redivivus myth to Christian eschatology, resulting in the section on the Antichrist.[2] The conclusion is that the Nero myth precludes Pauline authorship chronologically. Therefore, II Thess. is a mythological center fitted out with an introduction and exhortation.

Bousset[3] in his work on the legend of the Antichrist, showed that this Antichrist legend is independent of, and earlier than, the Nero Redivivus myth.

Masson revives the argument for inauthenticity using this same kind of an argument based on a divergent eschatology. "Saint Paul a donné à l'occasion un enseignement eschatologique, ainsi qu'en temoignent I Th. 4:13 a 5:11; I Cor. 15; mais l'enseignment apocalyptic de II Th. 2:1-12

---

1 F. H. Kern, "Ueber II Thess. 2:1-12, Nebst Andeutungen über den Ursprung des zweiten Briefes an die Thessalonicher," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie II (1839), pp. 145-214.

2 For a short description of this myth with references see, K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul (1911) pp. 78-79.

3 W. Bousset, The Antichrist Legend, (1896), pp. 127-28.

qu'on voudrait lui attribuer est se incompatible avec son enseignement eschatologique qu'on ne sait où l'y introduire."[1] For Masson this incompatibility in eschatological outlook reflects the mood and the questions of two different periods. I Thess. reflects the time of Paul. II Thess. reflects the concerns and the situation of the next generation.[2]

The second kind of an argument for the inauthenticity of II Thess. is based upon the close literary relationships between the two letters. Wrede[3] has made the most extensive study of this argument. Nearly three fifths of II Thess. is related in a most intimate way to I Thess. This relationship comes from the use of ideas, words, and epistolary outline.in a way which requires more than the hand of the same author. The argument for inauthenticity comes from the observation that the close parallels between the two epistles are too close and too mechanical to be the result of common authorship.

Rigaux, who defends the Pauline authorship of II Thess., is forced to admit that the argument of Wrede has a great deal of weight. "Il serait vain de nier que l'ensemble des resemblances littéraires entre I et II est frappante. Elle mérite qu'on lui cherche une raison."[4] This close literary

---

1 Masson, p. 11.

2 Ibid., pp. 12-13.

3 Wrede, pp. 3-36, see especially, p. 29.

4 Rigaux, p. 138.

connection is one of the reasons why an author like Graafen[1] advances the theory that Paul wrote the two letters with just a day in between.

The third major point upon which the authenticity of II Thess. is questioned is the difference in tone or personal warmth between the two epistles. I Thess. is warm and personal. The author seems to have a vital interest in his readers, and he deals with them in a very personal, intimate fashion. II Thess. to the contrary seems sharp and harsh.[2] Many have pointed out that Paul could vary in mood,[3] but the problem comes in that, if we hold the letters apart in time to show a change in mood, then we have difficulty with the literary parallels. The literary parallels become more and more of a problem the farther we hold I Thess. apart from II Thess. On the other side, if we hold the letters close together in time to account for the parallels, we have difficulty in dealing with the difference in tone and warmth.

Adolf von Harnack[4] reasoned from I Thess. 5:27 'Ενορκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς

---

1. J. Graafen, Die Echtheit des Zweiten Briefes an die Thessalonicher (1930), pp. 48-50.

2 For a detailed discussion of this argument see, Bornemann, pp. 466ff., and Wrede, pp. 75ff.

3 For example, J Klausner, From Jesus to Paul (1946), p. 239.

4 A. Harnack, "Das Problem des II Thessalonicherbriefs," Sitzungsberichten der Kgl. Prüss. Akademie der Wiss., Phil. Hist. Kl. (1910), pp. 560-78.

ἀδελφοῖς , that the πᾶσιν implied that there were two groups at Thessalonica, a Jewish group and a Gentile group. If I Thess. was to be read to"all" then II Thess. must be for the second group which was only part of the "all." This hypothesis allows for both closeness and remoteness. One group gets the warm letter, the Gentiles, and the other group, the Jews, gets the formal letter. The warm letter then is read to all.

A few other minor points have been noted,[1] which seem to hold the two letters apart, eg. outside of II Thess. Paul nowhere speaks of the Antichrist. However, the three arguments, (1) different eschatology, (2) unusual literary parallelism, and (3) the different tone of the two epistles, form the mould in which the case for the non-Pauline authorship is cast.

The defenders of the Pauline authorship have recognized the strength of the opponents case, in that they have had to deal with it seriously, and with great ingenuity. Individual points and arguments made against the Pauline authorship can all be explained or answered with one hypothesis or another, but the cumulative effect is still weighty.

Bousset's[2] work on the Antichrist brought to an end the identification of the apocalyptic material of II Thess. with

---

1 For a list see, Rigaux, pp. 142-43.

2 Cf. supra p.5 .

historical figures, as a basis for establishing the non-Pauline authorship of the epistle. This work of Bousset bolstered the defenders of the Pauline authorship, but this has not delivered the epistle safely into the Pauline camp.

The actual defense of the Pauline authorship has taken a multitude of forms, but the following are the general methods used.

1. Both letters are Pauline, but the order is reversed.[1] II Thess. was the first letter to be written, then I Thess. T. W. Manson[2] feels that if Paul sent Timothy back to Thessalonica, I Thess. 3:2, it would only be natural that he would also send a letter with him. This first letter was II Thess. The situation in Thessalonica was rectified and Paul now writes I Thess. This is a warm letter in which he rekindles the hope of the imminent parousia, which he closed off so fast in the first letter, i.e. II Thess.

This solution answers the problems of eschatology and tone, but not the problems of literary parallels. However, the serious defect in this theory is that I Thess. never mentions a previous letter, while II Thess. 2:2,15, 3:17 imply previous correspondence. Further, if Paul signs all his letters as he mentions at the end of II Thess., then why did ne not make his own peculiar mark at the end of I Thess.?

2. Both letters are from Paul, but II Thess. was sent

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 4.

2 Manson, p. 436.

to another church, i.e. Beroea or Philippi.[1] In Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians 11:3 the author uses a phrase which appears to come from II Thess. 1:4.[2] Schweizer uses this as evidence that II Thess. is in reality a letter to the Philippians. From this point of view one can argue both ways. The close agreements between I and II Thess. come because they were written at the same time. The differences in the two letters appear because they are going to two different church situations. This is the case where we have our cake and eat it too,

Not only does this theory rest on the rather ambiguous reference in Polycarp, but it presupposes that a falsified copy of the original displaced the original, and no one ever noticed it.[3]

3. Both letters are from Paul, and they are sent to the same church, but one is for one purpose/group, and the other is for another purpose/group. This solution comes in many variations. The traditional view is the most popular solution in this catagory.[4] In this view Paul writes

---

1 E. Schweizer, "Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief?," ThZ 1(1945),pp. 90-105, and M. Goguel, Introduction au Noveau Testament (IV; 1st part; 1922-26), pp. 335-337.

2 Cf. supra, p. 2, for discussion and texts.

3 For a refutation of Schweizer's case see, W. Michaelis, "Der II. Thess kein Philipperbrief," ThZ 1 (1945), pp. 282-285, and the reply of Schweizer, Ibid., pp. 286-289. Rigaux's comment is well taken, "Un texte peu sûr et obscur est un mauvais point de départ.," p. 67.

4 For a detailed defense of the traditional view see, Morris, pp. 83ff.

I Thess. then later he hears of disturbances in the church and writes II Thess. to correct them, This solution can account for the change in eschatological teaching, but it fails to do justice to the problem of literary parallels, and the fact that there is a complete lack of personal warmth and reference in II Thess.

Harnack's solution[1] seeks to overcome these last difficulties by having a divided church and a letter to two groups, one Gentile and one Jewish. The strongest argument against this case is that Paul never mentions nor seems to have any truck with a dual membership roll in the church. There is also the question as to why Paul should be more personal with the Gentiles than with the Jews.[2]

Dibelius[3] suggests that the first letter is a private letter written to the leaders, while the second is a public letter to be read to the entire congregation, hence the colder style. This solution could account for the literary parallels, (written at the same time), the difference in tone, (private, public), but when it comes to eschatology it is hard to see why a public letter to the same congregation, written at the same time would bring forth such a different approach.

---

1 Harnack, pp. 560-68, see also, K. Lake, pp. 83ff.

2 W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (1935), p. 281.

3 M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher (3rd ed.; 1937), pp. 57-58.

There are numerous variations on these basic themes, as scholars have tried to maintain the traditional authorship, and at the same time account for the different eschatology, the literary parallels, and the differences in tone.[1]

When we turn to the case for inauthenticity we find two basic solutions offerred.

1. The letters are Pauline in authority, but they are written by a companion or an assistant of Paul. Burkitt advocates this view. "My suggestion, therefore, is that both letters, (I and II Thess.) were drafted by Silvanus - Silas, that they were read to Paul, who approved them and added I Thess. 2:18, and II Thess. 3:17 with his own hand."[2]

This solution or even a variation on it, where Paul writes I Thess., and a companion writes II Thess. in fact comes down to be an artful dodging of the issues. If Silvanus writes both letters then we in fact have the same problems as we had for the Pauline authorship, except that we are just one step removed from Pauline authority. If Paul writes one and Silvanus the other, then we have pseudonymity, with a Pauline imprimatur. There is no more evidence for a companion of Paul being the author, (not the scribe), than for any other second generation Paulinist. If all we are trying to keep is the Pauline imprimatur on

---

1 For a complete list see, Rigaux, pp. 147ff.

2 F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings (1924), p. 132.

II Thess. by having Silvanus write it, then all we are really proving is that Paul did not do a very good job in proofing his companion's apocalyptic schema.

2. The second solution is that II Thess. is a later letter written in the name of Paul to correct a situation in the church, i.e. an over enthusiastic apocalypticism. Wrede[1] assumes this position and places the time of the letter at the close of the first century. Masson[2] sees II Thess. as the product of the second generation of Christians. This is parallel to the thinking in Matt. and Luke, where the primitive apocalyptic expectation is modified to equip the church for a "longer stay" in the world. Vielhauer takes much the same position. "Only in the post-apostolic generation do the Apostles of the Lord become the bearers and the guarantors of apocalyptic tradition (Jud. 17); and so the fictitious apostolic letter is the form of their communication, (II Thess., II Peter), providing a parallel to the Apocalypses with apostolic names."[3]

The arguments directed against this last hypothesis, (that the letter is a pseudepigraphic production of the second generation), are best summarized by Rigaux. "Ni les arguments tirés des vocabulaire, de la grammaire, du

---

1 Wrede, p. 91.

2 Masson, pp. 12-13.

3 P. Vielhauer, "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity, 1. Introduction," in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, eds. New Testament Apocrypha (1965), II, 610.

style, ni les différences eschatologiques ou théologiques ne sont retenus comme décisifs."[1]

This last remark indicates the kind of an impasse we now face. Those who reject the Pauline authorship have to find a suitable context out of which to interpret the epistle. Those who hold to the Pauline authorship finally have to admit that this solution can only be tentative.

A common assertion is that the Pauline authorship makes the exegesis of the epistle easier.[2] Others accept the traditional authorship as a working hypothesis, because in their view it raises the least number of difficulties.[3]

In short, after all the arguments are over, both sides agree that there are difficulties. The division comes in that one side feels the traditional authorship and order raises the least problems, while the other side maintains that the better solution is to place the epistle in the generation after Paul. We would like to propose another route for dealing with the epistle as a whole. The question of authorship needs to be postponed.

There can be no question as to the fact that I Thess. differs from II Thess. in tone and warmth. No one questions this observation. I Thess. is far more personal, more friendly, while II Thess. is formal and stern.

---

1 Rigaux, p. 147.

2 Frame, p. 52.

3 W. Neil, The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians (1950), p. xxi.

The questions we would like to raise concern the structure and the purpose of II Thess. How is this letter put together? What are its sources? Why was it written? From a study of the structure and the purpose of this letter, a base for the task of interpretation can be built, without first raising the authorship question.

The great weakness in attempting to solve the authorship problem first, is that we are tempted to do just what Frame[1] and Neil[2] do, i.e. formulate a working hypothesis and then justify it, because in their opinion this hypothesis makes the exegesis easier. Easier exegesis can gloss over real problems just as easily as it can solve them.

What we propose to do in this study is to investigate the structure of II Thess. by comparing it with I Thess. on the basis of epistolary form and literary affinities. The question to be answered by this part of the study is simply: What is similar and what is different in the two epistles? Can this tell us anything about the structure of II Thess?

In the latter part of this study we propose to investigate the purpose of II Thess. Certainly the purpose of the epistle has been discerned for centuries, but by comparing the apocalyptic section of the second epistle with other similar and parallel material we will be able to point with precision

---

1 Frame, p. 52.

2 Neil, p. xxi.

16b

to the purpose of the epistle, and set it within the general framework of developing Christian literature.

The problem of the "restrainer" in II Thess. 2:6-7 is one which will focus attention upon a major exegetical problem in the epistle, and will illustrate how a discussion of the structure and purpose of the epistle can open up exegesis without first adopting a "position" on authorship.

While it is the task of investigators to solve problems, and propose new ways to find answers, we still need to recognize that history has not left us every answer. Those who are hailed before a judge are presumed innocent until proven guilty. However, historical study is not a legal process. Documents are not presumed "innocent," or "authentic," or "Pauline," simply because they bear a name and have done so for centuries. If there are problems in assigning a particular document to a particular author, the "safer," or "more sound," method is not necessarily the traditional solution. If one wishes to make any kind of historical judgment about a document it is up to that person to justify his conclusions.

Perhaps through this survey and study a more firm foundation can be built, upon which again can be raised the question of authorship.

CHAPTER II

A COMPARISON OF THE EPISTOLARY STRUCTURE AND OUTLINE OF FIRST AND SECOND THESSALONIANS

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is three fold. First, we want to describe briefly, the letter form used in the Hellenistic world at the time of Paul, second, we will examine the Pauline[1] letter form, and third, we will compare the letter forms of I and II Thess.

The attempt of this chapter is to examine with precision, the similarities and differences between the two Thessalonian letters, with respect to epistolary outline. This will furnish a starting point for determining the structure of the second epistle.

The Letter Form in the Hellenistic World at the Time of Paul

When Paul wrote his letters to the mission churches he did so under the influence of a well developed letter writing tradition. Paul did not take pen in hand, or dictate

---

1 In our discussion of the genuine Pauline letters, the following will be used as the standard of comparison: Rom., I, II Cor., Phil., Gal., I Thess., and Philemon. This does not mean that we accept all of them as single letters. II Cor. and Phil. are collections of letters. Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die Vorgeschichte des sog. Zweiten Korintherbriefs," SHA (1961), pp. 2ff., and H. Köster, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Phil III)," NTS, 8 (1961-62), pp. 317ff.

to a scribe, and thereby create something new in terms of letter form. Paul used the general letter writing patterns of the time, modifying them to his own particular needs.

Paul's letters were real letters. They were written to concrete situations.[1] Deissmann has argued that Paul's letters were private letters pure and simple, with no marks of intended literary production. Surely they are not the works of an author who is self-consciously preparing material which he hopes will be published and offerred to the literary market.[2]

Paul's letters fall somewhere in between innocent notes sent from an apostle to his converts, and the conscious production of literary epistles.[3] However, this does not mean that the Pauline letters are less formal in structure, or less elegant in style than literary epistles. Even private letters in the Hellenistic period can have a very formal structure.[4]

The basic structure of the Hellenistic letter is composed of three parts: (1) the salutation naming the sender, the

---

1 A Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (1910), p. 245.

2 For examples of literary letters see, Phaleres, Typi Epistolares, or Proculus, De Forma Epistolari, in R. Hercher ed., Epistolographi Graeci (1873), pp. 1-13.

3 For a description of the place of these letters with respect to ancient literature and letter writing see, O. Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe (1933), pp. 23ff. See also P. Schubert, Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings (1939), p. 182.

4 Schubert, p. 181, cf. infra, p. 23.

recipient, and a greeting, (this is sometimes reversed), (2) the body of the letter giving the message, and (3) the conclusion, or farewell, sometimes with a signature.[1] This holds for all letters, be they innocent notes,[2] formal letters,[3] or literary epistles.[4]

The normal greeting in the salutation is χαίρειν , and the farewell is usually, ἔρρωσο, εὐτύχει, or ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι. The date of the letter, if it is included, comes after the farewell,[5] or sometimes on the verso.[6]

The authentication of the letter comes at three points. First, the letter was sealed, and the contents were self-authenticating. Second, the ἔρρωσο as part of the conclusion was sometimes written by the sender himself, and this stood out distinctly against the hand of the scribe.[7] Third, the letter, especially if it is legal or semi-

---

1 P. Wendland, "Die urchristlichen Literaturformen," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. H. Leitzmann (1912), I, 412.

2 See the letter of Hilarion, P. Oxy., 744.

3 See the letter of Seleucus II to Miletus, OGIS, 227, as quoted in C. Bradford Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (1934), p. 106.

4 Hercher, p. 98.

5 See the letter from Promithion to Zenon, P.S.I. 333, or the letter from Petasuchus to his friends, P. Grenf. ii, 36.

6 See the letter from Hierocles to Zenon, P. Cairo Zen. 59060.

7 Deissmann, p. 157.

legal, is witnessed or signed by the sender and witnesses.[1]

There are far fewer examples of Hebrew letters during the Hellenistic period. Some good examples are the letters found in the caves at Murabba'at.[2] The letter from the administrator of bet-masiko to Jesus son of Galgula[3] is a letter and also a semi-legal document. This letter illustrates the three part form we have been describing, only the language is Hebrew instead of Greek. The sender is identified with מן[4], the recipient with ל and the greeting is שלום. Following this salutation, comes the text, and in conclusion there is the farewell, וכל בית ישראל אהוה שלום. The substance of the letter is attested by the sender and witnesses.

In the letter of Bar Kosiba to Jesus son of Galgula[5] we find the same salutation מן־ל־שלום. After the content of the letter there is no farewell, just a signature.

It has been customary to refer to the greeting χαίρειν as the Greek form of the salutation, and שלום as the Hebrew form.[6] However, the difference between the Greek letter

---

1 Deissmann, p. 160.

2 DJD, II, passim.

3 Ibid, #42.

4 S. A. Birnbaum, "The Beth Mashku Document," PEQ (1955), p. 21, suggests that the sender is identified with a כן and not a מן following legal usage.

5 DJD, II, #43.

6 See Frame, pp. 71-72, and Rigaux, pp. 354-55.

form and the Semitic/Hebrew letter form is not the simple use of χαίρειν or שלום. The two letters from Murabba'at mentioned above, can be seen as letters in Hebrew, but with the same form as Hellenistic letters normally use. The form is the same, only the language is different.

However, the main difference between the Hellenistic and Semitic letter can best be seen in other documents.[1] In the Semitic form the salutation is composed of two cola. The first mentions the sender and the recipient, or vice versa, and the second colon is a greeting, sometimes lengthy and formal. For example in the letter to Bigvai governor of Judea, (408 B.C.), the second colon in the salutation reads:

> "The health of your lordship may the God of Heaven seek after exceedingly at all times and give you favour before Darius the king and the princes of the palace more than now a thousand times, and may he grant you long life, and may you be happy and prosperous at all times." 2

In II Macc. 1:1 Τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον Ιουδαίοις χαίρειν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οἱ ἐν Ιεροσολύμοις Ιουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἐν χώρᾳ τῆς Ιουδαίας εἰρήνην ἀγαθήν, ., there is a combination of the Greek χαίρειν , and the Hebrew greeting εἰρήνη. The form of this salutation is Greek, for there is only one colon. However, here we can

---

1 See Daniel 4:1, Sand. 11a, G.R. Driver ed. and trans., Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. (1954), passim, Bar. 78:2, and G. Friedrich, "Lohmeyers These über das paulinische Briefpräskript kritisch beleuchtet," TLZ 5/6 (1956), p. 346.

2 A Cowley ed. and trans., Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (1923), #30, see also #38.

see the influence of the Hebrew greeting שלום, imposing itself upon the Greek form.

The point to be made is that several factors play upon our description of the Greek salutation once the material we are dealing with comes out of a Semitic context.

In the Hellenistic world at the time of Paul another important feature of letter writing was the use of a thanksgiving or proem, many times in the form of a prayer, to begin the content section. The papyri give ample evidence for prayers as part of Hellenistic letters.[1]

This proem can be the gracious way of wishing the recipient good luck, or good health, or it can be a kind of liturgical prayer to a god on behalf of the recipient. In this latter case the sender and the recipient normally share the same religious viewpoint.[2]

The proem is very definitely part of the letter form. It is used even when the contents of the letter are in sharp contrast to the kind regards expressed in the proem. The following letter from a school boy to his father will illustrate both the form of the proem and the fact that it is a formal part of the epistolary style itself.

---

1 P. Giess. 17, B.G.U., 423, 846, P. Oxy. 528.

2 Schubert, pp. 122ff., examines the use of the proem or thanksgiving in Hellenistic literature. He shows the intimate nature of this form, in that it is used by people who share a certain relationship. However, his conclusion that the very use of this form indicates that the writer, consciously or unconsciously, is evaluating the quality of this intimate relationship is not substantiated. See pp. 183-84.

23

"To my lord and father Arion from Thonis greeting. Before all else I make supplication for you every day, praying also before the ancestral gods of my present abode that I may find you and all our fold thriving. Look, you, this is my fifth letter to you, and you have not written to me except only once, not even a word about your welfare, nor come to see me; though you promised me saying "I am coming," you have not come to find out whether the teacher is looking after me or not. He himself is inquiring about you almost every day, saying "Is he coming yet?" And I just say "Yes." Endeavour then to come to me quickly in order that he may teach me as he is eager to do. If you had come up with me, I should have been taught long ago. And when you come, remember what I have often written to you about. Come to us quickly then before he goes up country. I send many salutations to all our folk, each by name, together with those who love us. Salutations also to my teachers. Goodbye, my lord and father, and may you prosper, as I pray, for many years along with my brothers whom may the evil eye harm not. 1
(postscript) Remember our pigeons. (early 3rd cent. A.D.)

This letter uses the standard Greek letter words, χαίρειν and ἔρρωσο . A similar kind of proem in prayer form can be found in II Macc. 1:2-6.

"May God do good to you, and may he remember his covenant with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, his faithful servants. May he give you all a heart to worship him and to do his will with a strong heart and a willing spirit. May he open your heart to his law and his commandments,, and may he bring peace. May he hear your prayers and be reconciled to you, and may he not forsake you in time of evil. We are now praying for you here." 2

Here, of course, the letter form is used to promulgate literature, but it does show the formal aspects of this proem prayer.

The Hellenistic letter normally closes with greetings

---

1 Rev. ég. 1919, p. 201, as quoted in A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar eds. and trans., Selected Papyri (1932), I, 338-39.

2 Trans. from RSV Apocr.

and future plans,[1] and the correspondence may or may not be signed.

In summary, Hellenistic letters at the time of Paul can be outlined in the following manner.

I Salutation
  sender
  recipient (these may be reversed)
  short greeting usually χαίρειν

II Proem if used

III Message

IV Greetings, etc.

V Farewell usually ἔρρωσο
  sometimes with a written signature, or the farewell in the hand of the writer.

A Description of the Pauline Letter Form

The Salutation

A description of the Pauline letter form presents its own peculiar problems. The general outline is that of any Hellenistic letter, i.e. A to B, a greeting, a proem, content, greetings, a farewell with or without a signature. However, when we come to describe any individual point of the letter form we find that there are many other influences and even departures from the normal Hellenistic model.

The following elements comprise the normal Pauline salutation.

---

1 P. Grenf. ii. 36, B.G.U. 1079, P. Fay. 123, Rev. ég. 1919, p. 204.

1. The name of the sender:
   Paul only - Rom.
   Paul and associate(s) - I Cor., II Cor., Phil., I Thess., Gal., Philemon

2. A clause describing the author, his titles, etc., or a theological affirmation: This clause is lacking in I Thess.

3. The name of the recipient, with or without a modifying phrase:
   with - Rom., I Cor., I Thess., Philemon
   without - II Cor., Gal., Phil.

4. A greeting: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This formula is used in Rom., I Cor., II Cor., Phil., and Philemon. Gal. uses this same formula, but attaches another clause. I Thess. departs from the norm and only has χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.[1]

In Exler's extensive catalogue of salutations there are none as long as the salutation in I Cor. Even I Thess. which is the shortest among the genuine Pauline letters would be one of the longest salutations in Exler's catalogue. Paul also does not observe the strict Greek form that the salutation be expressed in the third person, eg. Gal. 1:1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος . . . καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί . . .[2]

While normal Hellenistic salutations contain modifiers and titles, they do not contain the type of theological affirmations which are woven into the Pauline salutations.

Paul's salutation also departs from the norm in that it has two sentences or cola. The first colon contains the sender and the recipient, and the second the greeting phrase. This structure, of course, is Semitic and not Greek.[3]

---

1 F.X.J. Exler, The Form of the Ancient Letter. A Study of Greek Epistolography (1923), pp. 60ff.

2 A Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction (1963), p. 349.

3 Cf. supra, p. 21.

The greeting χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη has been a puzzle to many investigators. Three general approaches have been made.[1] Dibelius wants to see χάρις as a Pauline substitute for χαίρειν, and εἰρήνη as the Hebrew שלום. But this does not explain why the salutations of Paul come in two parts. Delling[2] believes that the introductory formula of the letter is a literary expression of liturgicall language. "Hence it is probable that in the greeting 'Grace to you and peace . . .', we have a formula of introduction to the service."[3] Liturgical language does seem to have a role in these salutations.[4] However, Gerhard Friedrich seems to have uncovered the background of the Pauline salutation formula. "Die Artikellosigkeit der Salutatio und die Wortwohl erklären sich am besten aus dem voderasiatischen Briefformular. Der Briefgruss "Friede" ist alt und gebräuchlich, aber auch der Wunsch "Gnade" oder "Erbarmen" findet sich häufig, was man bisher zu wenig beachtet hat. . . . Auch die Zusammenstellung von "Gnade und Friede" im Briefpräskript ist nicht typisch paulinisch. Sie findet sich nicht nur in der bekannten Stelle syr. Bar. 78:2, sondern bereits in neuassyrischer Zeit."[5]

In brief we can say that Paul writes to his churches

---

1 M. Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature (1936), p. 142.

2 G. Delling, Worship in the New Testament (1962), pp. 49-50.

3 Ibid., p. 49.

4 E. Lohmeyer, "Probleme paulinischen Theologie," ZNW 2 (1927), pp. 158ff.

5 Friedrich, p. 346.

using the general outline of the Greek letter, but with a salutation which is influenced by Semitic epistolary style.

Roller[1] has pointed out that there seems to be a connection between the earlier epistles, I Thess., Gal., and certain variations in the salutations, almost as if Paul were experimenting. Roller does not distinguish between genuine and disputed epistles so some of his evidence must be held in abeyance, but hes is still essentially right. All the Pauline letters, (save the pastorals), after Gal., even II Thess., have the fixed greeting, χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,but the salutation itself does not always have the same words and sentences. Paul feels free to modify this wording and clause structure as the need arises.

The Proem

Paul, characteristically, opens his letters with a prayer of thanksgiving. In this prayer he praises the church and sets the tone for the letter. The one exception to this is Galatians where Paul takes up the problem at hand immediately, and breaks his normal pattern.

This prayer which opens the letter has three parts.[2]

---

1 O. Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe (1933), pp. 120-21.

2 Schubert, p. 54 outlines seven parts of the Pauline thanksgiving.
1 Principle Verb - εὐχαριστῶ
2 Personal object - τῷ θεῷ
3 Temporal adverb - πάντοτε

The first is a principle clause which has a fixed form.

Rom. 1:8 - Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν . . .

I Cor. 1:4 - Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν . . .

II Cor 1:3 begins with a prayer, but has a different form. Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . This form is parallel to I Peter 1:3 and may represent a form Paul used. However, since II Cor. is a composite, it would be difficult to see how we can use it to help describe the normal Pauline proem.

Galatians - There is no prayer of thanksgiving, but there is an expanded salutation which ends in an ascription of praise, Gal. 1:4-5. Paul rushes headlong into the argument.

Philippians 1:3 - While Philippians is also a composite, the opening prayer is similar to the other genuine Pauline epistles. Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν, πάντοτε ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν . . .

I Thess 1:2 - Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν . . .

Philemon 4 - Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου πάντοτε . . .

The normal Pauline phrase for starting the proem is εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν . To this is added a second part which is a clause praising the church through Paul's prayers for them.

Rom. 1:8-10 praises the church and makes reference to Paul's prayers on their behalf. The clause praising the

---

(n. 2, p.27, cont.)
4 Pronoun object phrase - περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν
5 A temporal participial clause with a temporal adverbial phrase - ποιούμενος μνείαν σου ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου
6 A causal participial clause or adverbial phrase - ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην
7 A final clause - ὅπως, ὅτι, ἵνα, etc.
Schubert further distinguishes two types of thanksgivings: Type Ia and Type Ib. Both are the same except Type Ib lacks parts 5 and 6 above.

church for their faith, 8b is a ὅτι clause and the clause about prayer is introduced with ὡς . This ὡς clause has the characteristic words Paul uses to tell his churches about his prayers, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου . . .

I Cor. 1:4 ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ

II Cor., Gal., lacking

Phil. 1:4b-5 - μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν δέησιν ποιούμενος, ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν,

I Thess. 1:2-4 - μνείαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, . . . εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι . . . ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν,

Philemon 4b-5 - μνείαν σου ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους,

The third part of this opening prayer is a final clause, beginning with conjunctions such as ὅτι, ὅπως, εἰς τό and inf., etc. In this clause Paul sets the tone of the letter, to some degree, and in some sense states the reasons for the letter.

Rom. 1:8b - ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ

I Cor. 1:5-7 - ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε . . .

II Cor., Gal., Phil., lacking

I Thess. 1:5ff. - ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον,

Philemon 6 - ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου ἐνεργὴς γένηται . . .

The beginning of the proem is easily identified since it begins with a particular verb, εὐχαριστεῖν , and the rather fixed formula which follows it. However, when we look for

the conclusion of the proem, there is a considerable amount of difficulty in finding it. The third part of the proem, the final clause or clauses,becomes a bridge between the prayer and the content of the epistle.

Schubert in his study of the Pauline thanksgiving looks for the conclusion of this prayer in what he calls an eschatological climax.[1] In Romans, Schubert finds the flow of Paul's style interrupted in 1:9-13, but the effective climax is reached at 1:16. He wonders whether, "vv. 10-17 are somewhere in the uncertain twilight between the receding thanksgiving and the rising theme of the letter?"[2] For Schubert the "thanksgiving" in Romans includes 1:3-17.[3]

Schubert finds no difficulty in concluding the opening proems of I Cor. and Phil. In I Cor. the proem ends with vs. 9 in an ascription of praise, πιστὸς ὁ θεός, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . In vs. 10 we are immediately brought into the substance of the letter.[4]

In Philippians the proem concludes with the prayer beginning in vs. 9, καὶ τοῦτο προσεύχομαι . . . and concludes in vs. 11 with the ascription, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ. Just as in I Cor. 1:10, Phil. 1:12 places us into another section.

---

1 Schubert, pp. 4-5.

2 Ibid., p. 5.

3 Ibid., p. 32.

4 Ibid., p. 4.

31

In Philemon, vs. 6 is the conclusion to the thanksgiving prayer, and vs. 7 appears to be a transition to the main body of the letter.[1] With vs. 8 we are certainly in the content of the letter.

Romans becomes more difficult to define. As we can see, it is easy to find the beginning of the prayer in 1:8, but the prayer is slightly different from the other genuine Pauline letters in the following ways.

1. The ὅτι clause which comes immediately after περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν in 1:8b normally does not preceed a phrase such as ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου , 1:9b-10a.

2. In this last phrase, ποιοῦμαι is finite and usually it is a participle, eg. ποιούμενος, Philemon 4.

3. Vss. 11-17 seem to be a slight digression in which Paul struggles to let the Romans know of his eagerness to see them, and share his gospel with them.[2]

In Romans the catagory of "eschatological climax" used by Schubert breaks down.[3] Formally the same kind of blessing

---

1 Schubert, p. 5.

2 Ibid., p. 5.

3 J. T. Sanders, "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus," JBL, 81 (1962), pp. 348-362. In this article Sanders makes an improvement over the method of Schubert for closing the thanksgiving. Sanders finds that Paul often uses a particular type of phrase to shift emphasis or take a new tack. The following is the general outline.

1. A phrase similar to παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, which counsels or exhorts the brethren.
2. A reference to authority, such as, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος

32

which ends the proem in I Cor. 1:9, occurs in Romans, but not until 11:36, αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς. αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

Obviously this raises the question of our definition of proem. If in Romans the proem takes up more than three quarters of the letter, then are we justified in calling it a proem?

Turning to I Thess. there is not one but three prayer formulas which fit the form of a thanksgiving prayer, I Thess. 1:2, 2:13, and 3:9.[1] The "eschatological climax" or closing

---

(Note 2, p. 31, cont.)

3. A phrase announcing a subject, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας . . . (which may be omitted)
4. A final clause giving an injunction, ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες . . .

Sanders finds that this form is often used as a sort of paragraph heading, p. 354. In I Cor. and Phil. this type of sentence structure immediately follows the close of the proem as deliniated by Schubert.

In I Cor. Sanders sees that the proem is concluded with a doxology, p. 358, "which begins πιστὸς ὁ θεός; and the question arises whether the phrase πιστὸς ὁ θεός may replace the conventional εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός of the Jewish beracha.", p. 359f.

The fact still remains that Sanders cannot use these characteristics of Pauline style to conclude in a satisfactory manner, the proem of Romans any better than Schubert. Sanders concludes that the proem in Romans is inverted, p. 360. However, the proper conclusion is that Paul skillfully weaves the thanksgiving prayer into the proem of his letters and feels no complusion to end his proem in a rigid, formal way.

Sanders observations are generally correct except he wants to impose a more rigid structure upon Paul than Paul uses.

1 Ibid., p. 356. Sanders wants to conclude the first thanksgiving prayer of I Thess. at 1:10 and see 2:1 as the opening of the letter. He defines his general transition form which is used to change from thanksgiving to body in the following manner.

"1. A verb in the first person on the present action stem

33

prayer comes in 3:13, Here again are we justified in saying that 1:2-3:13, or three fifths of the epistle is the proem? No other Hellenistic letter, apart from epistles under the influence of Pauline style has this kind of lengthy proem.

It is probably more correct to observe that in Rom. and I Thess. Paul moves from proem to content without a discernable break.

Schubert calls Paul a "Hellenist of the Hellenists"[1] because of his skillful use of the Hellenistic letter form, and its thanksgiving prayer form. While Paul's letter form is Hellenistic in many respects, his piety was Jewish in background,

---

(Note 1, p. 32, cont.)
which states the author's enjoining, usually παρακαλῶ (alternate form: a verb of wishing with an infinitive of knowing attached to item 3);
2. the particle δέ ;
3. the recipients of the injunction in the accusative, ὑμᾶς ;
4. the vocative ἀδελφοί ;
5. an appeal to the authority of the Lord for the saying, introduced with διά;
6. a prepositional phrase, introduced by ὑπέρ ; stating the topic of the injunction (which may be omitted); and
7. the injunction itself introduced by ὅτι or ἵνα , this clause being occasionally replaced by an infinitive phrase, " p. 349.

Sanders, p. 356 offers I Thess. 2:1 as an alternate to this form,
1. Οἴδατε αὐτοί - is neither in the first person nor a verb of wishing.
2. γάρ
3. lacking
4. ἀδελφοί
5. lacking
6. τὴν εἴσοδον ἡμῶν - this is no prepositional phrase.
7. ὅτι οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν - this is no injunction
Thus we are left with a γάρ and an ἀδελφοί and this hardly seems to be sufficient evidence upon which to build a transition, ending the proem of I Thess.

1 Schubert, p. 184.

and his liturgical phrases are certainly Jewish.[1]

In summary, the Pauline letter normally begins with a proem. This proem is initiated with a prayer, which comes out of the piety of Judaism, both in structure and content. In this proem Paul praises the churches, he seeks to capture their good will, and sets in some general way the theme for the contents of the letter. While it is easy to locate the beginning of the proem, the transition from proem to content is smooth, and sometimes so skillfully done, that there is no perceptible break.

The Contents of the Letter

The contents of Paul's letters certainly dictate the structure to some degree, eg. in I Cor. he spends most of the letter answering questions, while in Rom. he uses the letter, in the main, to produce a theological tract. However, there are several general points we can observe in the way Paul presents the contents of his epistles.

In general Paul follows a two part letter form. The first part begins with the proem, and it closes with a kind of benediction. Between these two Paul presents material

---

1 J. M. Robinson, "Die Hodajot Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," Apophoreta, ed. Walther Eltester, (1964), pp. 194-235. Robinson traces the thanksgiving prayer forms of Paul's letters back to the "Thanksgiving Psalms," of Qumran. "Heute aber könnte man über Schuberts wohl gelungene Beweisführung für den brieflichen und hellenistischen Character der paulinischen Danksagung, besonders des Types Ib, mit jüdischen - besonders heterodox - jüdischen - und frühchristlichen Gebeten finded." p. 202.

35

concerning his present circumstances, his ministry, theological instruction, and his relations with the church.

In Romans the whole first part, 1:8-11:36 is spent in theological argument. In I Cor. the proem begins in 1:4, and at 1:10 Paul takes up the issue of the situation in the Corinthian church and his relationship with the church. This subject continues until 6:20 where there is an exhortation, δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ *σώματι* ὑμῶν. I Cor. then continues in a special way, in that Paul takes up specific questions raised by the Corinthians. He uses the transition form περὶ δὲ . . .[1]

In I Thess. the pattern is similar to the pattern of Romans. It begins with a thanksgiving prayer in the proem, 1:2ff., and the proem seems to continue all the way to 3:13, where there is a prayer and a definite break. In this first part of I Thess. Paul discusses his relationship with the church and his present circumstances.

The second part of the content section of Paul's letters normally deals with exhortation, ethical instruction, and eschatological instruction. One of the characteristic marks of this second part of the letter is the transition word, λοιπόν , cf. I Thess 4:1, Phil 3:1, II Cor. 13:11.

1

I Cor. 7:1 - περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε
I Cor. 7:25 - περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων
I Cor. 8:1 - περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων
I Cor. 12:1 - περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν
I Cor. 16:1 - περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους

36

Romans has this two part form clearly marked,[1] as does I Thess. I Cor. has two parts, but the second part deals with answers to questions and specific subjects. II Cor. and Phil. are not helpful at this point because of their composite nature. Galatians has exhortation at the end of the letter, but there is no sharp break between the sections. Rather, the argument is on one basic theme and this gathers up the whole content section.

The deutero-Pauline[2] letters do give us evidence for the Pauline letter style in that they reflect to some degree what was understood as Pauline. In Ephesians for example, there is this two part structure of the content section. Part I begins with a proem and concludes with a benediction in 3:20-21 Then part II commences with ethical instruction. Colossians is similar in pattern but has no sharp break between parts I and II. II Thess. has the same general pattern as I Thess., i.e. a long part I with a prayer ending, and part II introduced with λοιπόν.

The contents of the Pauline letter are not presented in any rigid fashion, but there are some important characteristics.

1. The transition from proem to contents is smooth and sometimes imperceptible.

---

1 Rom. 12:1 is the transition from part I to part II of the content section. It does not use the transition word λοιπόν but it does have the standard form Paul uses to shift emphasis or change the argument, Cf. Sanders, p. 349.

2 Col., Eph., II Thess.?

37

2. Quite often Paul uses a two part scheme. Part I contains material concerning Paul, his work, and his relationship to the church and didactic material. Part II contains. exhortation, ethical instruction, and eschatological teaching.

3. Even where there is no clear two part form, the subject matter flows from didatic material to either instruction and exhortation.or eschatology, or both.

4. Often Paul uses prayers, benedictions, and ascriptions of praise to end major sections of his letters. He also uses the normal Greek transition words such as περὶ δέ and λοιπόν .

5. Paul uses certain characteristic sentences to shift emphasis, and begin new sections.[1]

The Conclusion of the Letter

The closing paragraphs of the Pauline letter follow the general pattern of the Hellenistic letter. These paragraphs contain greetings, a farewell, and sometimes a personal farewell or note in Paul's own hand. The major difference between the Pauline letter closing and the normal Hellenistic letter closing is that Paul uses liturgical phrases and benedictions in saying farewell, while the normal Hellenistic letter uses ἔρρωσο etc. The situation of Paul, i.e. being a missionary pastor with associates, dictated some of the characteristics of the closing paragraphs, eg. Paul told

---

1 Sanders, p. 349.

38

them of future travel plans, there are greetings from other workers, and there is the special relationship between pastor and people which is expressed in the final benediction or exhortation.

The closing of the Pauline letter normally contains four basic elements.

1. travel plans
2. a final exhortation
3. greetings
4. a benediction, which may or may not be in the hand of the writer himself

Romans has two complete conclusions.
15:22-29 travel plans
15:30-32 final exhortation
15:33 benediction

16:1-16 general greetings
16:17-20 final exhortation
16:21-23 greetings from other workers, the scribe
16:25-27 benediction

I Cor. carries this same pattern.
16:5-18 travel plans and final exhortation
16:19-20 greetings
16:21-24 benediction

II Cor. appears to preserve the conclusion to the letter contained in chapters 10-13. This is a very brief and stern conclusion. There are no travel plans, just as in Galatians there are no travel plans, Gal. also has a stern conclusion written by Paul himself. Both II Cor. and Gal. end with a benediction.

I Thess. has the normal Pauline pattern.
5:25 final exhortation, no travel plans
5:26 greetings
5:27-28 benediction

39

Philemon also preceeds in the same pattern.
21-22 final exhortation and travel plans
23-24 greetings
25 benediction

In verse 18 Paul mentions that he writes with his own hand, "he will repay." This is probably a legal practice, where Paul shows that he assumes financial responsibility.[1]

Deissmann[2] has suggested that Paul may have signed the final benediction in all his letters, even though he makes no reference to it in some of the letters. The signature would be the final benediction in his own hand. In the Bar Kosiba correspondence we do find that the letter writer, not the scribe, signed his name.[3] It is possible that Paul, himself, took pen in hand and at the end of the letter wrote the benediction. Certainly we know this is the case in I Cor., Gal., and Phm.

There are signatures in Col. and II Thess. and, at the

---

1 Cf. DJD, II, p. 156. In this semi-legal letter there are signatures of witnesses, and of the sender in their own hand.

2 Deissmann, p. 158f. produces one, perhaps two examples of first century letters in which the ἐρρώσσο is in a hand other than the scribe's, yet with no reference to the writer.

3 DJD, II #42,43. Milik's reconstruction of #43, line 7, to read שמעון בן כוסבה על נפשה is questioned by Y. Yadin, in his report on "Expedition D," in IEJ 11 (1960), p. 45. Concerning the Bar Kosiba letters found in the cave on the northern cliff of Nahal Hever, Yadin says, "since none of the letters in our possession is signed by Bar Kosiba himself, it may be assumed that the person who signed the Murabba'at letter was another Shimon as in the case under discussion, And since each of the letters is written in a different hand, it may be concluded with certainty that they were not written by Bar Kosiba himself."
For a different view see, S.A. Birnbaum, "Bar Kokhba and Akiba," PEQ (1954-55), pp. 30f.

least, these deutero-Pauline epistles prove that it was known that Paul signed his letters. However, whether he did so in each and every case, we just do not know.

A Description of the Epistolary Structure of I Thessalonians

The epistolary structure of I Thess. is certainly Pauline, but it has a few pecularities all its own.

The salutation meets all the tests of a Pauline salutation. Paul mentions himself and his two co-workers, Silvanus and Timothy. It is addressed to the church in Thessalonica, ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. The second colon is simply, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. The unusual feature of this salutation is the brevity. It is the shortest and least complicated of the Pauline salutations.

The proem begins in 1:2 with the normal thanksgiving prayer and continues to 1:10.[1] The unusual feature of I Thess. is that Paul picks up the form of the thanksgiving prayer again in 2:13 and 3:9. In all of the other Pauline epistles, both genuine and doubted, excluding II Thess,, there is only one thanksgiving prayer form, and that begins the proem.

Certainly I Thess. is the epistle where it is most difficult to talk about proem, content and conclusion, simply because of the multiple thanksgivings. However, it follows the general two part outline of Pauline epistles. The Proem and Part I extend from 1:2 to 3:13 where there is a well

---

1 Schubert, p. 26, wants to see the entire section from 1:2 to 3:13 as the proem. Dibelius, Comm., p. 43, and Sanders, p. 356, close the proem at 1:10.

41

developed benediction. Part II begins with the transition word λοιπόν , I Thess. 4:1, and extends to 5:23-24 where there is another well developed benediction.

In Part I, 1:2-3:13 there is no material which could not be part of a Pauline proem. The only question is that of length, and the rather well developed argument in 2:1-12 which deals with Paul's apostleship. At this point the tidy classification of proem and content breaks down. Following our general observation on p.34, we will talk about the proem of I Thess. as the material from 1:2-10. I Thess. 2:1ff. puts us into the first part of the letter, but Paul in this case continues the thanksgiving prayer form in 2:15 and 3:9, as a means to convey his personal feeling and joy over the progress of the Thessalonian church reported by Timothy, I Thess. 3:6. The important thing to see is that the thanksgiving prayer in I Thess. is not just a letter form per se, <u>but it enters into the very content of the letter itself as an actual extension of Paul's immediate joy.</u> Contrast this with the proem in I Cor. 1:4-9 where Paul uses the same prayer form, but it functions strictly as a letter opening. In I Cor. the prayer is not worked into the content. Rather it stands out in contrast to the content. In I Cor. Paul merely follows his letter style. In I Thess. the proem is merged with the content.

Part I of I Thess. deals with Paul and his relationship with the church. Part II deals with ethical and eschatological instruction, and this subject placement is proper Pauline style.

42

The letter terminates with a rather brief conclusion, which includes a short exhortation 5:25, Ἀδελφοί, προσεύχεσθε περὶ ὑμῶν , a greeting 5:26, a request that the letter be read to all the brethren, 5:27, and a final benediction, 5;28. There are no travel plans mentioned, but the most we can conclude from this is that Paul did not have any immediate travel plans.[1]

According to this analysis, the epistolary outline of I Thess. would look like this.

Salutation - 1:1
Proem - 1:2-10
Contents Part I 2:1 - 3:13
- 2:1-12 Paul's relations with the church as apostle
- 2:13-16 Continuation of the thanksgiving prayer
- 2:17-3:6 Paul's concern for the church and the report of Timothy
- 3:7 - 10 Continuation of the thanksgiving prayer
- 3:11-13 a benediction

Contents Part II 4:1-5:24
- 4:1-8 Exhortation on morality
- 4:9-11 Concerning the love of the brethren
- 4:12 - 5:11 Eschatological instruction
- 5:12-22 General exhortations
- 5:23-24 A benediction

Conclusion - 5:25-28

The important points to note here are the length and the tone of the Proem and Part I, the presence of three thanksgiving prayer forms, the well defined benedictions at the end of Parts I and II, and the fact that the eschatological instruction occurs in Part II.

---

1 If we assume the normal position that Paul wrote I Thess. from Corinth, at the beginning of his ministry there, then we could easily read the lack of travel plans in I Thess. as an indication that Paul was neither traveling, nor planning an immediate trip.

A Description of the Epistolary Outline of II Thessalonians

Looking at II Thess. it becomes plain that this letter has an outline which is practically identical with I Thess. However, there are some striking differences which raise questions about the nature of the similarities. The basic structure of II Thess. can only be seen in comparison with I Thess.

The salutation of II Thess. is identical with I Thess. word for word until we reach the second part, i.e. the second colon. I Thess. has χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη for the second colon. II Thess. has χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

II Thess. has ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ in the first colon, as does I Thess., but II Thess. uses this phrase in the genetive, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου . . in the second colon. In the genuine and deutero-Pauline epistles, all but Col. and I Thess. have the same second colon as II Thess. has in their salutations. However, no other Pauline epistle, genuine or doubted has this same phrase twice. The salutation in II Thess. is overloaded, stylistically, yet, in spite of this peculiarity, no other two Pauline salutations proceed, word for word, as do I and II Thess.

The proem of II Thess. has a normal opening,[1] but like

---

1 For a discussion of the phrase εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν Cf. infra, p. 51.

I Thess. there is a departure from the normal Pauline style. There are three thanksgiving prayers in II Thess. as in I Thess. The first occurs in 1:3, the second in 1:11, and the third in 2:13. The form in II Thess 1:11 does not use the characteristic verb, εὐχαριστεῖν , but προσεύχεσθαι . However, the remainder of the sentence shows that it generally follows the thanksgiving prayer form.[1]

The conclusion of the proem in II Thess. is just as difficult to find as it is in I Thess. Both epistles have the same formal outline. Both have three thanksgiving prayers in the Proem and Part I. Both conclude Part I with a well defined benediction. Both begin Part II with the same transition word, λοιπόν , and both conclude Part II with a well defined benediction.

The conclusion of II Thess. has a greeting, 3:17, written in Paul's own hand, a remark about authenticating letters, ὃ ἐστιν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ οὕτως γράφω and a benediction, 3:18.

The outline of II Thess. is as follows

Salutation - 1:1-2
Proem - 1:3-12
- 1:3-5 prayer and final clauses
- 1:6-10 apocalyptic proof text on suffering
- 1:11-12 continuation of the thanksgiving prayer

Contents Part I - 2:1-17
- 2:1-12 eschatological argument and instruction
- 2:13-14 continuation of the thanksgiving prayer
- 2:15 exhortation to stand firm in the tradition
- 2:16-17 a benediction

---

1 Schubert considers it a partial thanksgiving prayer form, p. 29.

Contents Part II - 3:1-16
3:1-5 general exhortations and request for prayer
3:6-15 instructions and exhortations about idle brethren
3:16 a benediction
Conclusion 3:17-18

There are several points af which II Thess. seems to follow I Thess. but in reality II Thess. has a different structure. Both epistles seem to have an extended proem with three prayer forms continuing the opening prayer into the content of the epistle.[1] In I Thess. we noticed how the content of Part I, i.e. the joy over Timothy's report, carried the thanksgiving prayer along. However, in II Thess. the prayers in 1:3, 11, and 2:13 function much more formally. The content of II Thess. Part I is eschatological instruction, something which occurs only in Part II of the other Pauline letters. In 2:15 the response to the thanksgiving prayer is an exhortation to stand firm in the tradition, ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν.

The pecularity of II Thess. at this point can best be seen if we remember that several points foreign to Paul's normal letter style come together at once. (1) The salutation repeats a Pauline phrase in a non-Pauline manner. (2) Eschatological instruction is given in the first part of the letter. (3) The outline is substantially identical with I Thess. and this is peculiar because no other two Pauline letters are parallel in epistolary outline as these

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 41.

two epistles. (4) In II Thess. 3:1, τὸ λοιπόν , instead of being a transition which leads directly to the exhortation section, leads to a request for prayer, 3:1. Normally one would expect τὸ λοιπόν to go with II Thess. 3:16.

The great difference between I and II Thess. is that while II Thess. is less than half the length of I Thess. it has the same basic epistolary outline, and thus appears to be a letter of more form than content. With regard to style, I Thess. is far more artistic, in that if flows from one section to another, while II Thess. spends most of the time laboring the framework.

To say that Paul wrote both letters is not enough to explain the agreement in epistolary form. If one wishes to hold to the common authorship of I and II Thess., then he has to explain the agreement in epistolary structure on some other basis. For example, Paul copied one from the other, or Paul wrote them from a common model, etc. As noted in Chapter I this second, necessary factor, is where the problem of authorship arises.

Our conclusion is that the epistolary structure of II Thess. is taken from I Thess.[1] but with some basic differences. (1) The prayer forms in II Thess. do not fit the content in the same way as they do in I Thess. (2) II Thess. has a peculiar

---

1 The reverse of this argument, I Thess. is modeled on II Thess. cannot be held for two reasons. II Thess. mentions previous letters, but I Thess. does not, and also it is very difficult to see a writer like Paul change his writing style and model a stylistically pleasing letter on a rather cold cumbersome letter, written a short time before. The structure and style of I Thess. is flowing and natural. The structure and style of II Thess. is contrived and cumbersome.

salutation, parallel with I Thess., but combining Pauline elements in a non-Pauline manner. (3) II Thess. has eschatological instruction in the first part of the the epistle, which never occurs in the other Pauline epistles. The epistolary framework of II Thess. is cumbersome with regard to its content and length, while the epistolary framework of I Thess. harmonizes well with the content.

CHAPTER III

THE LITERARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND THESSALONIANS

Wilhelm Wrede[1] has made the most exhaustive study of the literary relationship between these two epistles. His purpose was to show the dependance of II Thess. upon I Thess. and thereby establish the non-Pauline authorship of the second epistle.[2] Wrede's work is essential to our purpose for it provides the key by which we can unlock the structure of the second epistle. Wrede examined the literary relationship in order to establish the dependance of one upon the other. We want to observe both the similarities and differences[3] in order to see how the second epistle is put together.

Rigaux[4] attempts to show that II Thess. is as much Pauline in style as any other Pauline letter, and Jülicher has given usthe terse remark, "Wenn wir I Thess. nicht besässen, würden wir II Thess. nicht beanständen." However, we do have I Thess. and as we have seen in the last chapter

---

1 Wrede, Die Echtheit . . ., p. 3-36.

2 Ibid., p. 36, "Der Verfasser muss also ein Späterer gewesen sein, und der Brief ist eine Fiktion."

3 It has often been observed that the parallels between the two epistles occur in only certain places, but our purpose is to show why they do, and to show how their structure is related to the purpose of the epistle. For a discussion of this structure see, Hartmann p. 179, Beasley-Murray, p. 182, Rigaux, p. 151.

4 Rigaux, pp. 85-94, 150-152.

49

II Thess. departs from the normal Pauline letter style at significant points. The question behind Wrede's work and the question we need to bear in mind is simply, does this second epistle reflect a dependance upon I Thess. so as to necessitate an explanation of dependance which must go beyond common authorship? This question not only poses the authorship problem, but it also poses the problem of structure.

The method of comparison used here is the method of Wrede. We want to discover the literary relationship between the epistles, the relationship between words and phrases and epistolary structure, and the reasons for these relationships. What is presented is based on Wrede's work, but the argument has been directed toward a clarification of the structure of the second epistle, rather than the authorship.

Salutation[1]

II Thess. 1:1-2	I Thess. 1:1
Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.	Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.

These salutations proceed parallel word for word, and this is unique in the Pauline corpus. The addition of ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρός

---

1 This epistolary outline refers to II Thess. only, and it is included merely as a reference point in the discussion.

50

καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [1] to the salutation in II Thess. departs from normal Pauline usage, since this same phrase is never found in both cola of the salutation elsewhere.[2]

John Knox[3] has suggested that originally I and II Cor. and I and II Thess. were written together with one greeting and one benediction. Several letters, in the case of Cor. were included in one. Later Cor. and Thess. were separated and new addresses were composed, accounting for the similarity between the salutations. Yet no matter how one accounts for the similarities, the fact remains that the salutation in II Thess. is identical with the salutation in I Thess. save for the unusual use of the same phrase twice in II Thess., and no other Pauline epistles are this identical, Cor. included.

Knox's thesis would have more weight if the rest of the second epistle did not follow so closely the outline of the first epistle. There is no question that Knox's thesis is a possibility, but in view of the similar epistolary structure of the two epistles, the more probable explanation is that II is modeled on I.

---

1 The ἡμῶν inserted between πατρός and καί, ℵ A et al., is omitted on the basis of harmony with the other epistles. B D for text. See Rigaux, p. 608 for criticism.

2 Cf. supra, p. 43.

3 John Knox, "A Conjecture as to the Original Status of II Cor. and II Thess. in the Pauline Corpus," JBL 55 (1936), pp. 145-153.

Proem

II Thess. 1:3-4

Εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἑνὸς ἑκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν αἷς ἀνέχεσθε,

I Thess. 1:2-4

Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, μνείαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, ἀδιαλείπτως μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος

I Thess. 3:12

ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς

There is a close agreement in the thanksgiving prayer formula used in both epistles. This is normal for the Pauline letter, save for the fact that the construction in II Thess. 1:3 has a wording not found elsewhere in Paul, i.e. ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν , instead of the normal finite form of εὐχαριστεῖν. This construction occurs twice, II Thess. 1:3 and 2:13.

Dibelius[1] finds that ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν and καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν[2] appears to have a cooler tone, and Rigaux wonders about the influence of these phrases upon the liturgy and not vice-versa. The same phrase is found in

---

1 Dibelius, p. 40.

2 Rigaux, p. 613.

62

I Clem. 38:4, ταῦτα οὖν πάντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες ὀφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν . . . and Bar. 5:3, οὐκοῦν ὑπερ-ευχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι . . . It is odd that this phrase in II Thess., which is in a liturgical context in I Clem. and Bar., and which is not dependent upon II Thess. in these two letters, should be the only departure from the normal Pauline finite use of εὐχαριστεῖν . The point which makes it more peculiar is that this phrase is repeated, in a letter which takes its epistolary structure from another letter in which the normal form is used.

II Thess. 1:3 has the phrase, πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη . Πλεονάζειν[1] is a common Pauline word but in II Thess, 1:3 the subject of the verb is ἀγάπη , and in I Thess. 3:12 the same verb, πλεονάζειν is again connected with the noun ἀγάπη , now a dative of respect. These are the only two places in the Pauline corpus where πλεονάζειν is connected with ἀγάπη.

One of the characteristics of the prayer in the Pauline proem is that Paul mentions specific qualities or virtues, with which he praises the church. In I Thess. 1:3-4 there is a cluster of nouns, objects of Paul's remembering, τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος . In II Thess. 1:3-4, in the prayer of the proem the same three words appear, πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή . While it is part of Paul's style to use words like πίστις and ἀγάπη in

---

1 Rom. 5:20, 6:1; II Cor. 4:15; 8:15; Phil. 4:17; I Thess. 3:12; II Thess. 1:3.

53

the prayer of the proem, cf. Philemon 5, ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον , it is worthy of note that the proem prayer in both I and II Thess. have the same nouns. No other Pauline epistles, save Philemon have these same nouns used in the proem in this way.

Wrede[1] points out that the word πίστις in II Thess. 1:4 is used in a different and non-Pauline sense. In II Thess. 1:4, πίστις means "faithfulness" in the face of persecution.

The verb ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι is used only once in the N.T.[2] The Pauline literature uses καυχᾶσθαι . The "boasting" in II Thess. 1:4 is related to the churches round about, and how the Thessalonians are lauded for ὑπομονή , and πίστις in persecution. However, in I Thess. 2:19 the"boasting" is not before the churches, but before the Lord. Here Paul boasts of his crown, i.e. the Thessalonians themselves.

While many of the words are identical in II Thess. 1:3-4, and I Thess. 1:3-4, the use of the words and the actual subject matters are different. In I Thess. 1:3-4 the proem prayer is God directed, i.e. Paul remembers the Thessalonians before God, and mentions God's election of them. In II Thess. 1:3-4, the proem concerns itself with the Thessalonian's reputation among the other churches, especially for their endurance and faithfulness. An interesting point is that both the subjects of "boasting" and "persecution" are found

---

1 Wrede, p. 6.

2 With respect to the text this is the more difficult reading.

54

elsewhere in I Thess. In I Thess 2:14f. there is "persecution," and in I Thess. 2:19 Paul boasts of the Thessalonians, not to other churches, but before God. The picture here appears as if the writer had taken the outline and key words from the proem in I Thess., and added to this, the subject matter in a slightly modified form, from another part of I Thess.

II Thess. 1:5	I Thess. 2:12
. . . εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ	. . . εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ . . .

The parallel phrases here would seem to be a parallel of style, showing no more relationship than the pen of the same writer, except for the use of the verb, καταξιωθῆναι . The more than casual relationship comes from the fact that II Thess. is the only epistle to use καταξιωθῆναι , and it is the only Pauline epistle to use ἀξιοῦν[1] or a composite of this verb. Yet when we turn to the Apostolic Fathers, καταξιωθῆναι becomes a very common verb.[2] The word Paul would normally use here is κληρονομεῖν .[3]

II Thess. 1:6-10

II Thess 1:6 is a peculiar verse in the Pauline corpus,

---

1 excluding I Tim. 5:7

2 I Clem. 41:4, 50:2; Ign. Eph. 20:1; Mag. 1:2; Trall. 12:3; Rom. 2:2; Philad. 10:2; Smy. 11:1; Poly. 1:1, 7:2, 8:2.

3 Cf. I Cor. 6:9,10, 15:10; Gal. 5:21.

55

for it directly couples the punishment[1] of persecutors, not sinners,[2] with an apocalyptic type of punishment.

In II Thess. 1:6-10 there are no parallels to I Thess. It is as if a whole piece of material were inserted here. However, there is a similarity in material which alludes to O.T. texts.[3] Wrede sees a parallel between II Thess. 1:7, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ and I Thess. 3:13, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου. . . Ἰησοῦ μετὰ. . . τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, and also II Thess. 1:8, ἐκδίκησιν. . . τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν Θεόν and I Thess. 4:5-6, τὰ μὴ εἰδότα Θεόν. . . ἔκδικος κύριος. As can be seen in the next chapter where these O.T. allusions are analyzed,[4] the context for them preserved in II Thess. is more akin to the original context in the O.T. itself, than is the context in I Thess. Wrede was correct in observing a parallel, but in this case the parallel is not due to the dependance of II Thess. upon I Thess. rather it is due to a common early-

---

1 Wrede, p. 17, "Der Ausgangspunkt für diese kleine Digression, der Gedanke an die θλῖψις, liegt auch im ersten Briefe vor I, 1:6."

2 The closest Pauline parallel we have is found in Rom. 12:20, but here the reference to punishment is certainly a "passing quote" from Prov. 25:21-22. While Paul speaks of judgement, he, nevertheless, does not elsewhere couple apocalyptic destruction with the punishment of persecutors, as does the Apoc. 9:4, 16:5ff., 19:15. The argument is not whether Paul could have used this image, or whether images of this nature were around in the air at Paul's time. The point is, Paul does not use this kind of an image, so perhaps the author of II Thess. was using a source.

3 Wrede, pp. 24-25.

4 Cf. infra, p. 73.

Christian apocalyptic tradition.

II Thess. 1:11	I Thess. 1:2-3
Εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πληρώσῃ πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης καὶ ἔργον πίστεως ἐν δυνάμει,	. . . μνείαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, ἀδιαλείπτως μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως

In the proem prayer in I Thess. 1:3, there were three nouns, which were the object of Paul's remembering.[1] In II Thess. 1:11 the proem prayer is continued and has the same phrase, ἔργον πίστεως , as I Thess 1:3. The unusual point is that this phrase is found only in these two passages in the Pauline corpus, and both occurances come within the epistolary proem.

Yet in these passages the same phrase carries with it a different meaning. In I Thess. 1:3, τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως is the deed accomplished by faith.[2] Paul remembers what faith produced in the Thessalonians. In the second letter, the work of faith is seen as a virtue which God is asked to fulfill in the lives of the people addressed.

Contents Part I

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 52.

2 Frame, p. 76, Masson, p. 18, Rigaux, p. 362.

II Thess. 2:1	I Thess. 5:12
Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ'αὐτόν. . .	Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί... .

Ἐρωτᾶν is not a common word in the Pauline corpus. It occurs four times, Phil. 4:8, I Thess. 4:1, 5:12, and II Thess. 2:1. In Phil. and I Thess. it introduces paranetical material. In II Thess. it introduces doctrinal material.

Certainly parallels of this type do not prove very much in and of themselves, but coupled with parallels in epistolary outline, and the strange un-Pauline use of Pauline words, Wrede's argument begins to acquire weight. Something more is going on here than common authorship.

II Thess. 2:5	I Thess. 2:9, 3:4
Οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὢν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν	μνημονεύετε γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν προελέγομεν ὑμίν

There is nothing here to indicate a relationship save that of similar wording. However, it is worth while to note that the phrase in II Thess. 2:5 can be built out of I Thess. 2:9, 3:4, and that while the words are roughly the same, the argument is different. In II Thess. 2;5, the argument concerns the remembering of specific eschatological doctrine, while in I Thess. 2:9, Paul asks the Thessalonians to remember his labor and toil. What the Thessalonians were asked to remember in I Thess. 3:4 is that they were told; they would

58

suffer. II Thess. 2:5 appears to be a combination of two distinct expressions from I Thess.

II Thess. 2:1-12

Except for the similarities in II Thess. 2:1 and 5 there are no literary relationships between the two epistles in this section. Again, as in the case of II Thess. 1:6-10, this apocalyptic section, 2:1-12 appears to be inserted with only a slight attempt to integrate it, stylistically, into the epistle.

II Thess. 2:13	I Thess. 2:13
Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου, ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ. . .	Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδιαλείπτως, ὅτι. . .

This is a repetition of the opening thanksgiving prayer form in II Thess. 1:3.[1] The prayer form is repeated using the peculiar construction, ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν. The striking point about this parallel is not that the words are similar, the common form accounts for this, but it is that there are only two Pauline letters which have a repetition of the thanksgiving prayer, and in these two letters, they occur in almost

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 51.

59

the same place, line for line.[1]

However, the usage of the prayer is different in these two passages. In I Thess. 2:13 the prayer is a response of Paul to the fact that the Thessalonians received the word of God, and that it became operative in them. In II Thess. 2:13 the prayer is used as a prayer, περὶ ὑμῶν , not because of the congregation, but because God has chosen them to be saved. This prayer acts as a response to the apocalyptic predestination of sinners to destruction, cf. 2:11-12.

II Thess. 2:13b-14	I Thess. 1:4
ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ-	εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι
αρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ	ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν. . .
πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας,	I Thess. 4:7
εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ	οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς
τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν εἰς περι-	ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. . .
ποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	I Thess 5:9
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	ἀλλὰ εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας
	διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
	Χριστοῦ

The verb αἱρεῖν in II Thess. 2:13 is used to express the choice of God. This is the only time this verb is used in a Pauline passage which expresses God's choosing. In Phil.

---

1 Wrede, pp. 7-8, shows how II Thess. 2:13-14 can be composed from words and phrases in I Thess. 2:12-13, 1:2-4, 4:7, and 5:9. In this construction Wrede observes, "Abgesehen davon, dass I, 1:2-4 die Wendung vom Danken den Gedanken der göttlichen Wohl und die Phrase ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (II: ὑπὸ κυρίου) mit dem andern Briefe gemein hat, ist bemerkenswert, dass diese Phrase sich bei Paulus nur in den Thessalonicherbriefen findet."

60

1:22 Paul uses αἱρεῖν for his own choice. The normal Pauline word for the choice of God is ἐκλέγειν.[1]

Ἁγιασμός is a common Pauline word.[2] Yet there are only two places where this word is associated in a sentence with the verb καλεῖν , II Thess. 2:13b-14 and I Thess. 4:7.

II Thess. 2:14 ends with the same series of words as does I Thess. 5:9, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ At first glance this would seem to be a standard phrase, except that it is connected with the noun περιποίησις , in both epistles. This noun is only used three times in the Pauline corpus, in these two passages and in Eph. 1:14.

II Thess. 2:15	I Thess. 3:8
Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε. .	ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ

Another minor agreement between the two epistles in this section is the appearance of the verb στήκειν . This verb is common enough, and that it appears in both epistles is no surprise, but in both epistles it appears just before the prayer which closes the first section in each letter.

However, the usage here is quite different. In I

---

1 I Cor. 1:27,28; Rom. 8:33, 16:33, 9:11, 11:5, 11:28. These same words are used extensively in the Apostolic Fathers to refer to God's choosing. However, αἱρεῖν is used only once, Herm. 59:6, for the choosing of God.

2 Rom. 6:19, 22; I Cor. 1:30, I Thess. 4:3,4,7.

61

Thess. 3:8 στήκειν refers to Paul's joy and personal involvement in the fate of the Thessalonians. Paul is comforted and maintained by the knowledge that they "stand in the Lord." In II Thess. 2:15 στήκειν becomes an exhortation, an admonition to adhere to the traditions they were taught.[1] As Wegenast has shown, this usage does not refer to the apostolic tradition given through Paul, but to the tradition which was received and taught in the community.

II Thess. 2:16-17	I Thess. 3:11-13
Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν	Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ
Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ὁ	ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν
Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ	Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν
ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς	ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ
παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν καὶ	ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ
ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν ἐν χάριτι,	περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς
παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας	ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας,
καὶ στηρίξαι ἐν παντὶ	καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς,
ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ.	εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς
	καρδίας. . .

This is the prayer or benediction which concludes the first part of the content section in both epistles. What we can see here in miniature is the special relationship between the two epistles. The relationship is deeper than that of comparable outline and common authorship. Both prayers come at the same point in the epistolary outline. Both

---

1 K. Wegenast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (1962), pp. 117-118.

62

prayers have the same form. Both prayers have τὰς καρδίας as the object of στηρίξαι[1], and these are the only two places in the Pauline corpus where καρδία and στηρίξαι are so connected.[2]

Contents Part II

II Thess 3:1	I Thess 4:1
τὸ λοιπὸν προσεύχεσθε ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζηται καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς,	Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, . . .
	I Thess 5:25
	Ἀδελφοί, προσεύχεσθε καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν.

Λοιπόν is a common transition word in the Pauline letter form.[3] It normally marks the transition from didactic to exhortatory material. Again the formal epistolary outline is parallel, and the transition word used is the same. A phrase from another part of I Thess. Ἀδελφοί, προσεύχεσθε καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν , is used to introduce the exhortation section of II Thess. Προσεύχομαι is a common Pauline word, but only here in I and II Thess. do we find the particular verb form προσεύχεσθε .

The request for prayer is normally part of the final

---

1 The optative form for the prayer or benediction is normal in Pauline style.

2 Στηρίξαι occurs in Rom. 1:11, 16:25; I Thess. 3:2, 3:13; II Thess. 2:17, 3:3.

3 Cf. supra, p. 37.

exhortation in the Pauline letter form, Rom. 15:30,[1] and the phrase in I Thess. 5:25 functions that way also. In II Thess. this request for prayer is part of the contents of the letter and not part of the final exhortation.

II Thess. 3:3	I Thess. 5:24
Πιστὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος ὃς στηρίξει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.	πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς ὃς καὶ ποιήσει.

This is Pauline vocabulary and usage, but the unusual feature is that a similar construction, πιστὸς. . ., ὅς should occur once before, I Thess. 5:24, and once after, II Thess. 3:3, and identical verb and verb form, προσεύχεσθε.

The phrase φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ may be due to the influence of the Lord's Prayer, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ , Matt. 6:3, Did. 8:3. This would indicate the liturgical character of the Pauline letter-form tradition to some extent.

---

1 As Wrede, p. 9, has observed there are several places where Paul asks for or mentions prayer, Phil. 1:19; Philemon 22; II Cor. 1:11, but none of these requests are in the imperative. The point which Wrede does not pick up is the misplaced epistolary imperative in II Thess. It looks as if the writer of II Thess. had taken a final exhortation from I Thess. 5:25 and placed it in the text of II Thess. 3:1, where in normal Pauline usage it would never appear in this imperative form.

64

II Thess. 3:4	I Thess. 4:11
. . . ὅτι ἃ παραγγέλλομεν καὶ ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιήσετε.	. . . καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν,

The verb παραγγέλλειν is a rather rare word in the genuine Pauline epistles.[1] It appears twice outside our epistles, I Cor. 7:10, 11:17. Παραγγέλλειν is used once in I Thess. 4:11, and then four times in the third chapter of II Thess. 3:4,6,10,12. When II Thess. gets around to "laying down the law," the normal word παρακαλεῖν, used so often by Paul is used only once, but the uncommon word, παραγγέλλειν is used four times. The striking point is that this verb παραγγέλλειν is the one which is found in I Thess. 4:11 where its subject matter, "work," happens to be the topic under discussion in II Thess. This same point regarding subject matter, (work), carries throughout the third chapter of II Thess. in verses 3, 10, and 12, where παραγγέλλειν occurs.

II Thess. 3:5	I Thess 3:11
ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.	Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κυρίος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς,

The verb κατευθύνειν occurs in these two passages and

---

1 The verb appears several times in I Tim., but this is no source for Pauline usage.

and Luke 1:79 and nowhere else in the N.T. I Clem. uses it in 48:8 and 60:2. The optative is present because of the prayer form, but the occurance of this particular verb in a prayer form in these two epistles is due to more than random occurance.[1]

II Thess. 3:6-7	I Thess. 4:1-2
Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν ἀδελφοί, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περι-πατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε πῶς δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς.	Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐρω-τῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν θεῷ, καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε, ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον. οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ 5:14 . . . τοὺς ἀτάκτους

The observations concerning the verb παραγγέλλειν in II Thess. 3:4 also apply here.[2] This entire passage shows a remarkable similarity to the passage in I Thess. in vocabulary.

In the N.T. the adverb ἀτάκτως occurs only in II Thess. 3:6 and 11.[3] The verb ἀτακτεῖν occurs only in II Thess. 3:7.

---

1 Wrede, pp. 9-10. The use of the optative in the prayer form is analyzed by Sanders, p. 350ff.

2 Cf. supra, p. 64.

3 See the discussion of ἄτακτος in Rigaux, pp. 582-84, Frame, p. 197, and the note in Milligan, pp. 152-54, and Wrede, p. 11.

The noun ἄτακτος occurs only in I Thess. 5:14. In the Apostolic Fathers, only the adverb ἀτάκτως occurs, and that only once in I Clem. 40:2. This is another good example which reinforces the observation that the literary relationship between the two epistles is built on more than random occurance.

II Thess 3:8	I Thess 2:9
οὐδὲ δωρεὰν ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, ἀλλ' ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν	μνημονεύετε γάρ, ἀδελφοί, τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι προς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν

[1]

Here is a direct parallel between the two epistles. When this parallel is compared with a similar passage, I Cor. 4:12, one has to come to the conclusion that here one of the Thessalonian letters is directly dependent upon the other. The verb ἐπιβαρεῖν occurs only three times in the N.T., here and in II Cor. 2:5. It does not occur in the Apostolic Fathers.

II Thess. 3:10a	I Thess. 3:4
καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἦμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς,	καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν,

---

1 Wrede, p. 27, cites this parallel along with the epistolary salutation as the two uncontestable parallels in the epistles. Even Rigaux, p. 136, sees this as a weighty argument.

This parallel is not ususual, nor does it signify anything more than just a standard phrase, one could expect to find in any letter. However, the fact remains that in all the Pauline corpus, it is only in these two letters that such a phrase occurs.

II Thess. 3:11-12	I Thess. 4:10b-11
ἀκούομεν γάρ τινες περι- πατοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν <u>ἀτάκτως</u>, μηδέν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περι- εργαζομένους, τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις <u>παραγγέλλομεν</u> καὶ παρακαλοῦ- μεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἵνα <u>μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι</u> <u>τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν</u>,	Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί, περισσεύειν μᾶλλον, καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι <u>ἡσυχάζειν</u> καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργά- ζεσθαι ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν καθὼς ὑμῖν <u>παρηγγείλαμεν</u> 5:14 . . . τοὺς <u>ἀτάκτους</u>,

as the subject of "work" continues there is the same constellation of words and expressions. Within these verses are two interesting items, the ἀτάκτως, ἀτακτεῖν and ἄτακτος parallel mentioned above, p. 65, and the second point which brings these passages together, the word ἡσυχία. Outside of I Tim. 2:11,12, this word only appears twice in the Pauline corpus, in the noun form in II Thess. 3:12, and as the verb ἡσυχάζειν in I Thess. 4:11.

II Thess. 3:15	I Thess. 5:13-14
καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν <u>ἡγεῖσθε</u>, ἀλλὰ <u>νουθετεῖτε</u> ὡς ἀδελφόν	καὶ <u>ἡγεῖσθαι</u> αὐτοὺς ὑπερ- εκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ διὰ . . .

τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν, εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, <u>νουθετεῖτε</u> τοὺς ἀτάκτους,

Νουθετεῖν and ἡγεῖσθαι are both Pauline words, but it is only in these two letters that they both come together in one sentence. Further, the implied object, i.e. the ἄτακτοι of νουθετεῖν in II Thess. 3:15 is the expressed object of νουθετεῖν in I Thess. 5:14.

II Thess. 3:16	I Thess. 5:23
<u>Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης</u> δώη ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην διὰ παντὸς ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ, ὁ κύριος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.	<u>Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης</u> ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη, πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει.

These are the prayers or benedictions which close the second part of the content sections. Structurally they both appear in the same place in the epistolary outline. It is worth noting that they both begin with the same phrase.

<u>Conclusion</u>

II Thess. 3:18	I Thess. 5:28
ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.	ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.

I and II Thess. end with an identical benediction. It is Pauline, but nowhere else in Paul do we find another identical benediction, or pair of identical benedictions.

Certain conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of the structure of II Thess. In the preceding chapter it was shown that II Thess. followed in a general way the epistolary outline and style of I Thess., with some rather startling digressions, eg. the inclusion of apocalyptic material in the first part of the epistle. In this chapter it has been demonstrated that this epistolary parallel is reinforced by literay relationships which occur in profusion at the very points where the epistolary framework is dealt with, eg. prayers, benedictions and transitions.

The very points at which II Thess. departs from the epistolary outline of I Thess. are the points at which this peculiar parallelism stops, i.e. II Thess. 1:6-10, 2:2-4, 6-12. Approximately one third of II Thess. is not related to I Thess., and this is normally considered the "main topic," or the "reason the letter was written."[1]

Another set of parallels between the epistles are related not because of epistolary outline, but because of the subject matter under discussion.

In II Thess. 2:13b-14, and I Thess. 1:4, 4:7, 5:9 the concept of God's choosing is mentioned. Yet these passages are parallel at points other than subject matter.[2]

When II Thess. wants to mention the things which were commanded, II Thess. 3:4, 6 10, 12, the word which is used is

---

1 For example see, Neil, p. 155.

2 Cf. supra, p 59.

παραγγέλλειν,[1] and the same verb is used in I Thess. 4:11. In both epistles the subject under discussion is "work." Likewise in II Thess. 3:11-12, I Thess. 4:10a-11[2] and II Thess. 3:15, I Thess. 5:13-14 the subject is "work," and these passages also have other literary relationships. The subject matter under discussion as well as the epistolary outline tends to focus the literary affinities of the two epistles.

With regard to the authorship question, it would seem that any fair minded observer would have to conclude that if Paul were the author of II Thess., he would have had to write both epistles at the same time, or keep a copy of I Thess. which he then read over, and used as an outline for II Thess. Otherwise the conclusion is that someone else wrote it. However, there are more problems than these in the authorship question. Yet the main point here comes to this, there are just too many places where I and II Thess. share pecularities, and common phrases to explain them all on the basis of an author's style. No other two genuine Pauline letters share such a close relationship.

It is possible to construct an historical situation in which Paul himself could be the author of both epistles, He kept a copy of I Thess. and used it later when he wrote the second epistle. To account for the non-Pauline elements in the second epistle, we could add that Paul employed a

---

1 Cf. supra, p.64f.

2 Cf. supra, p. 67.

secretary who used great freedom of expression.[1] In the next chapter we shall argue that the apocalyptic sections of II Thess. are not Pauline, but part of the early church apocalyptic tradition. If this is the case, then our "constructed historical situation" can ascribe the letter to Paul, but he is really not necessary for the same letter could have been written without him. The only thing left to Paul wouldbbe the signature.

II Thess. is composed of two types of material. (1) material of an apocalyptic type which is found in 1:6-10, and 2:1-12, and (2) material from I Thess. which has been re-worked and re-combined within the general epistolary pattern of I Thess.

Outside of the apocalyptic sections, no new subject matter not already mentioned in I Thess. is added to the epistle. In structure, II Thess. appears to be a piece of apocalyptic teaching skillfully fitted out with a Pauline letter context.[2]

---

1 G. J. Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century," CBQ 28 (1966), pp. 465-477, cautions that Paul may have used a secretary, who may even have used a type of shorthand, in a manner which gave this secretary great freedom, as some of the emperors did, and, "There may be less of Paul in the Pauline Corpus than we have been assuming," p. 477. Certainly this type of speculation can only lead to the conclusion that Paul did not write II Thess.

2 F. H. Kern, "Ueber II Thess. 2:1-12. Nebst Andeutungen über den Ursprung des zweiten Briefs an die Thessalonicher," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 2 (1839), p. 214, "Sein apokalyptisches Gemälde, 2:1-12, welches der eigentliche Kern des Ganzen ist, umzog wie mit einem Rahmen, welchen er aus dem dem ächten paulinischen Briefe entnommenen entwarf, . . ." C. Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church (1894), p. 297, makes the same point.

CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS OF THE APOCALYPTIC MATERIAL IN II THESSALONIANS

Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is limited in that this analysis is aimed at establishing one specific point. We intend to show that II Thess. 1:6-10, 2:2-4, and 2:7-12 come from an apocalyptic source, which the author of II Thess. adapted and fitted into the framework he borrowed from I Thess. This analysis will also show that this apocalyptic material is directly related to the apocalyptic material contained in I Thess. 4 and 5, Mk. 13 and par., and Did. 16. In conclusion we want to show how the author used this material, and how he structured his argument.

The Relationship to I Thess.

In the last chapter, p. 54, we noted that there was some kind of a relationship between II Thess. 1:6-10 and I Thess. 3:13 and 4:5 in that both epistles used similar apocalyptic phrases and O.T. allusions. Since we have such a close literary relationship between the two letters elsewhere, we need to see if any substantial relationship exists between these two letters here, also.

II Thess. 1:8	I Thess. 4:4-6
διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ,	εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν, τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, διότι ἔκδικος κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων,

In I Thess. 4:3-8 Paul reiterates his teaching on sexual behavior. He reminds the church that this was part of his original teaching, I Thess. 4:2 οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Paul admonishes the Thess. to possess their wives, σκεύη,[1] in holiness and honor and not in the passion of lust, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεὸν.

This final phrase is a common Jewish reference to the Gentiles. The specific argument Paul is using in I Thess. 4:2-8, comes out of the wisdom tradition, and is the same kind of argument Paul uses in Romans chapter 1.[2]

The phrase, τὰ ἔθνη. . . etc. is already found in the

---

1 Rigaux, p. 504f. understands σκεῦος as "body" meaning that, "Le 'vase' ici mentionné est la personne tout entière et nous évitons de reporter sur Paul les distinctions trop crûment grecques entre l'âme et le corps." However, in an unpublished sapiential text from Qumran, John Strugnell has found the phrase אל תקל כלי חוקכה, and in the same section אשת חוקכה. This parallel would seem to tip the scale in favor of reading σκεῦος as wife and not body. However, the problem still remains, as to the precise meaning of κτᾶσθαι.

2 Cf. Wisdom of Solomon, Chs. 13-15 for the argument.

LXX, Jer. 10:25 and Ps. 78:6, ἔκχεον τὸν θυμόν σου ἐπὶ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα σε καὶ ἐπὶ γενεὰς αἳ τὸ ὄνομά σου οὐκ ἐπεκαλέσαντο.[1]

The interesting point in the relationship between I and II Thess. is the context of this phrase, τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν Θεόν , in both epistles. In I Thess. it is set within the anti-Gentile polemic of the wisdom tradition. In I Thess. 4:6 it is coupled with judgement, ἔκδικος κύριος .[2] This judgement motif is present also in the wisdom tradition.

However, when we turn to II Thess. 1:8 we find the same terminology, διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν Θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. Here the context is not sexual purity from an anti-gentile polemic, but the context is that of divine retribution upon those who are persecuting the church, and it preserves the original context of Ps. (LXX) 78 which is a cry for divine retribution upon Israel's enemies.

Since II Thess. preserves the more primitive context of Ps. 78, and does not use the wisdom context of I Thess. we cannot simply conclude that II Thess. is using I Thess. directly. The most we can argue for is an indirect relationship in that the O.T. allusion in I Thess. brought to mind in the author of II Thess. some other material, because its

---

1 Both Jer. 10:25 and Ps. (LXX) 78:6 have the same wording, with substantially the same variants. The Jer. passage is probably a later insertion into the text from the post-exilic psalm. Cf. John Bright, Jeremiah (The Anchor Bible: 1965), p. 74.

2 Cf. Wisd. of Sol. 16:16,18.

original context fitted the subject, the author was dealing with. However, more likely there is no relationship between the two epistles at this point. I Thess. has one argument using a standard O.T. like phrase, and II Thess. has another argument using a similar form of this O.T. like phrase. We cannot find any direct relationship between the two epistles at this point.[1]

II Thess. 1:7	I Thess. 3:13
ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ	ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ.

II Thess. 1:10

ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύσασιν.

The language here can be traced to the LXX, eg. Ps. (LXX) 67:36 θαυμαστὸς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, and Ps. (LXX) 88:8 ὁ θεὸς ἐνδοξαζόμενος ἐν βουλῇ ἁγίων, μέγας καὶ φοβερὸς ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς περικύκλῳ αὐτοῦ. The closest parallel in the LXX seems to be Zech. 14:5, καὶ ἥξει κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ . . .

However, there is also an immediate and an important

---

1 Wrede, p. 6, too easily equates the two epistles at this point because he does not recognize the two different contexts and kinds of arguments going on.

16

relationship between these Thess. passages and the synoptics, i.e. Matt. 25:31, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, and the other synoptic passages which couple the coming of the Son of Man and angels, Matt. 13:41, 16:27, 24:31, Mk. 8:38, 13:27, and Lk. 9:26.[1]

In II Thess. 1:7 the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven is accompanied with the wording, μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. When we come to determine the relationship between I Thess. 3:13 and II Thess. 1:7 this phrase about the angels becomes the key.[2] What we have here are two phrases very similar to one another, but which reflect two different backgrounds. One is Daniel 7:13f. which is part of the synoptic apocalypse tradition, and the other background is Zech. 14:5. We can see these two backgrounds explicitly presented in Didache 16:7b-8 ὡς ἐρρέθη ἥξει ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Here the quote from Zech. 14:5 is

---

1 Rigaux, p. 627.

2 Cf. Rigaux, p. 637 for a discussion of the exegetical weight to be placed upon the word δύναμις. We prefer to read μετ' ἀγγελων δυνάμεως as something more specific, as does Frame, p. 232. "The ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ suggests the ἄγγελος δυνάμεως (Test. XII, Jud. 3:10) and "all the angels of power and all the angels of principalities," (Eth. En. 61:10); and invites the translation, "his angels of power." While it would be helpful to our case to find with Rigaux, p. 627, that, "Les anges et la puissance sont deux entites differentes," and couple this with Matt. 24:30 to produce a conclusive parallel between the Son of Man from Daniel and this passage, we can only find that "his angels of power" are part of that apocalyptic schema, which is not consistant in its use of terms and images. Of course Rigaux is correct in relating Matt. 24:30 and II Thess. 1:7 but not for this reason.

a proof text for the resurrection of the saints. In I Thess. 3:13 the phrase in question comes as a part of a prayer, and is not handled as a quotation. Further I Thess. 3:13 uses the O.T. allusion in its Zech. sense, where ἅγιοι means "angels" and not "saints."[1] In Didache we find the clear distinction, "saints" and "clouds of heaven," In II Thess. 1:7b and 1:10 we find "saints" and "his angels of power."[2] As we shall see in the next section, p. 79, there is no question that the traditional material which lies behind the Matt. account of the synoptic apocalypse, Matt. 24., is found in I Thess. 4:15ff.

---

1 Clearly Zech. 14:5 understands ἅγιοι as angels, or as some kind of heavenly beings. The question debated in the commentaries is whether Paul understood ἅγιοι in the Didache 16 sense, as Paul normally equates ἅγιοι with the saints on earth, or whether Paul here uses ἅγιοι in the Zech. sense. The decisive argument against the normal Pauline usage, ἅγιοι - saints, is that Paul's eschatology elsewhere in I Thess. speaks against it. I Thess. 4:16 specifically says that the dead in Christ will be raised first, so that both the living and the dead can meet the Lord in the air. Now to bring in the idea that I Thess. 3:13 does not mean the "first" return of the Lord, but the "last judgement", Frame, p. 139, is certainly a harmonization of the text with some constructed eschatological scheme. Rigaux, p. 492 is closer to the point when he says, "dans une formule oratoire ou liturgique de couleur apocalyptique, on ne fait pas necessairement attention à la stricte logique du development des situations." However, the trouble many commentators have, i.e. Findlay, Lightfoot, Frame, Rigaux, is that they keep reading this passage against the realized eschatology of Col., Eph. Once we stop the subtle harmonizing of I Thess. with Col., Eph. we can use Rigaux's suggestion that here we have liturgical usage, and whether Paul was conscious of the distinctions we make, is rather doubtful. At any rate I Thess. taken by itself yields, ἅγιοι - angels, as with the original in Zech. 14:5.

2 For a discussion of the relationship between Did. 16, II Thess. 1:7b,10 and the Synoptic Apocalypse, cf. infra, p. 96.

But it is misleading to conclude that I Thess. 3:13 has directly influenced II Thess. 1:7b,10.[1]

Again, the most one can conclude is that I Thess 3:13 brought to mind in the author of II Thess. two related sayings from the traditional Christian apocalyptic material. Then the author of II Thess. fitted this traditional material into his epistle. However, this, again, is far more unlikely than the fact that I Thess. makes use of traditional material, and II Thess. makes use of traditional material, and at these two points, I Thess. 3:13, 4:4-6, overlaps with II Thess. 1:7b-10. There is no direct evidence for a borrowing from one epistle to the other here.

Relationship to the Synoptic Apocalypse

Several studies have been made which show the relationships between the Thess. letters and the synoptic gospels.[2] The whole terminology of I Thess. 4:16-17 can be paralleled in the synoptic apocalypse, especially Matt. 24, eg. the angels, the trumpet, and the clouds of heaven. There can be little doubt that Paul was passing on common eschatological teaching,

---

1 As Wrede indicates on p. 25.

2 The most recent studies are: L. Hartman, Prophecy Interpreted (1966), pp. 178ff., J.P. Brown, "Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form History," NTS 10 (1963-64), p. 45, Rigaux, Comm. (1956), pp. 98ff., and J.B. Orchard, "Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels," Biblica 19 (1938), pp. 19ff. The parallels we shall reproduce are taken from the table on pp. 98-101 in Rigaux. However, the arguments for the parallels will be structured so that at the end of this chapter we can see how the material functions, and how it is used.

I Thess. 4:15 τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου.....

This "word of the Lord" is passed on as having indisputable authority.[1]

I Thess. 4:15	Matt. 24:27,37,39
εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου	ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

— A glance at the concordance shows that παρουσία[2] occurs only in Matt., in gospel material, and then only in Matt. 24:27,37,39. In the Pauline epistles παρουσία is used in the common way to mean arrival, eg. I Cor. 16:17 χαίρω δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ Στεφανᾶ. Yet there are several places where Paul uses παρουσία to mean the coming of the Lord, I Cor. 15:23, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, see also I Thess. 2:19,5:23.

Since in Matt. 24:27 we are not only dealing with the synoptic apocalypse, but also the Son of Man background from Daniel 7, we can see a Son of Man reference in I Thess. 4:15.

---

1 The source of this "Word of the Lord" is another question. It is not the creation of Paul, for the material is used not only here, but in I Cor. 15 where it is called a "mystery." The synoptic apocalypse is composed of this same material, and nowhere can one show the dependance of Mark upon I Thess. or I Cor. for this material.

2 Wrede, p. 23, wants to see II Thess. 2:1 related to I Thess. 4:15. While on the surface, and because of the other parallels in the epistles this conclusion may seem justified, the analysis here and on p. 83, shows that an early Christian apocalyptic discourse is far more likely the cause of this parallelism.

80

This will become clearer as we progress.[1]

I Thess. 4:16	Matt. 24:31
ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ.	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης

Another pecularity of Matt. 24 is the reference to the σάλπιγξ. Matt. has the only reference. It is lacking in Mk. and Lk. This trumpet is also found in I Thess. 4:16, and I Cor. 15:53, and it forms the second parallel between Matt. 24, and I Thess. 4.[2] The voice of the archangel may be the trumpet, but we still have the connection of "angels" and "trumpets" which brings these two verses even closer together.

I Thess. 4:17	Matt. 24:30
ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου	καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

These two verses are parallel in the reference to "clouds." The three items, the παρουσία , and theσάλπιγξ , and ἐν νεφέλαις , lock these passages together, and they show that even though Paul did not make use of the figure, Son of Man, he did take all the trappings which were to accompany the Son of Man. Further, these three items in I Thess. show that

---

1 Here we do not mean that Paul used the figure of the Son of Man. He did not. But Paul has the same material the synoptic apocalypse has, at the points the synoptic apocalypse deals with the Son of Man.

2 Cf. Apoc. 1:10, also the discussion in Rigaux, p. 543.

81

an earlier form of the synoptic apocalypse was considered authoritative for Paul, that Paul, more than likely, knew of the Son of Man title, but rejected it, and that the writer of II Thess. does not have to go outside I Thess. to find the Pauline authority to use this particular material.

There are further points of contact between I Thess. 5 and Matt. 24. These confirm the use of a common Christian body of material concerning eschatology, which was authoritative in the church less than 20 years after the crucifixion. These points of contact are:

I Thess. 5:1	Matt. 24:36
περὶ δὲ <u>τῶν χρόνων</u> καὶ τῶν <u>καιρῶν</u>	περὶ δὲ <u>τῆς ἡμέρας</u> ἐκείνης καὶ <u>ὥρας</u>
I Thess..5:2	**Matt. 24:43**
ἀκριβῶς οἴδατε ὅτι ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς <u>κλέπτης</u> ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται	ὁ <u>κλέπτης</u> ἔρχεται
I Thess. 5:3	**Matt. 24:19**
ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδὶν τῇ <u>ἐν γαστρὶ</u> ἐχούσῃ	οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς <u>ἐν γαστρὶ</u> ἐχούσαις
I Thess. 5:6-7	**Matt. 24:42**
ἄρα οὖν μὴ <u>καθεύδωμεν</u> ὡς οἱ λοιποί, ἀλλὰ <u>γρηγορῶμεν</u> καὶ νήφωμεν, οἱ γὰρ <u>καθεύδοντες</u> νυκτὸς καθεύδουσιν, καὶ οἱ <u>μεθυσκόμενοι</u> νυκτὸς <u>μεθύουσιν</u>	<u>γρηγορεῖτε</u> οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρα, ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται.
	Mark 13:36-37
	μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης εὕρῃ ὑμᾶς <u>καθεύδοντας</u>. ὃ δὲ

82

ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω,
γρηγορεῖτε.

Matt. 24:49,50

ἐσθίῃ δὲ καὶ πίνῃ μετὰ τῶν
μεθυόντων, ἥξει ὁ κύριος
τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου

When we turn to II Thess. many other points of contact between it and the synoptic apocalypse appear. However, these points of contact come at entirely different places.

II Thess. 1:7ff.

ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου
Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ'
ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. . .
ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν
τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ

Matt. 24:30,31

καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν
νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ
δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς καὶ
ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ
μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, καὶ
ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς
αὐτοῦ

Matt. 25:31

ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ
καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ'
αὐτοῦ

The parallels between these passages do not prove any kind of literary dependance, nor do they prove the existance of a common source. They do, however, show similarities of language. Here the terms "Son of Man" and "the Lord Jesus" could easily be interchanged. These parallels do

83

show a common tradition, and when coupled with other points of contact, as we shall examine next, they show a dependance upon a specific tradition, a specific-limited eschatological teaching.

II Thess. 2:1	Matt. 24:27,37,39
. . . ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν. . .	ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
	Matt. 24:31
	. . .καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων. . .

As noted above p. 79, the word παρουσία links together I Thess. and the Matt. form of the synoptic apocalypse. The same kind of argument holds here, not that II Thess. borrows the word from I Thess., but that both are using a common source. II Thess. 2:1 is the only place in the Pauline corpus where the word ἐπισυναγωγή appears. In Matt. 24:27,37,39 παρουσία , appears, and in Matt. 24:31 ἐπισυναγωγή appears. II Thess 2:1 uses ἐπισυναγωγή to mean exactly the same thing as the word does in Matt., i.e. the gathering of the saints by the Son of Man/the Lord Jesus.

Now, here is the specific link which will bring together II Thess. 1:7b and Matt. 24:30,31. II Thess. uses "Son of Man" material, but the title is changed to "the Lord Jesus." The immediate background of II Thess. 1:7b is the apocalyptic tradition in the church, which derives from the Daniel 7:13f. tradition.

84

II Thess. 2:2	Matt. 24:29
εἰς τὸ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι	καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται
	Matt. 24:6
	μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων ὁρᾶτε μὴ θροεῖσθε

The same kind of relationship between II Thess. and the synoptic apocalypse carries on here. II Thess. 2:2 is the only place in the Pauline corpus where σαλευθῆναι appears. Θροεῖσθαι makes the case even stronger, for it only appears four times in the N.T., here and in the three parallel verses in the synoptic apocalypse, Mk. 13:7, Matt. 24:6, and Lk. 24:37.

However, the words used do not tell the whole story, In II Thess. σαλευθῆναι and θροεῖσθαι are applied to the readers. In Matt. 24:29 par. σαλευθῆναι is applied to the "powers." Θροεῖσθαι in both II Thess. and Matt. apply to "disturbances." Only in Matt. the disturbances come from "wars and rumors of wars," while in II Thess. the disturbances relate to the understanding of the παρουσία and its proximity. Both have the same "disturbances" only II Thess. applies the word directly to the readers themselves.

II Thess 2:3	Matt. 24:4
μή τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον	βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ

These two verses are related because they have the same subject, i.e. a warning against being deceived.[1] Since this idea of deception is in such close proximity to the word θροεῖσθαι, in both places, i.e. II Thess. 2:2,3; Matt. 24:4,6, the conclusion is that this parallel is stronger than that of simple idea association.[2]

II Thess. 2:3-4

ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι, ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστιν θεός.

Matt. 24:4,5

Βλέπετε μη τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός.

Matt. 24:15

ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω.

While these passages raise many questions at to their background and interpretation, the only question we are pursuing

---

1 Rigaux, p. 102f. dismisses parallels like this too easily. Granted, "Les mots ne se rejoignment que pour exprimer les mêmes thèmes du message. Ce sont les mots de la prédiction primitive," but when a series of words, unusual words for the Pauline corpus, fall into line, we need to draw a more detailed conclusion than Rigaux does.

2 Hartman, p. 198, "If we now add to this the possibility that what men may be misled into thinking in II Thess. is that the day of the Lord has come, the similarity becomes quite great between this and the statement in Matt. that the danger is that people will appear and say that they are the Christ, and in Luke that the time is at hand (ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν)."

86

at the moment is the relationship between II Thess. 2:3-4 and the synoptic apocalypse.[1]

The first relationship is that both use imagery which relates to Daniel. II Thess. 2:4, ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρομενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, relates to Daniel 11:36, καὶ ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ παροργισθήσεται καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν ἔξαλλα λαλήσει. . .

In II Thess. 2:4 the Man of Lawlessness takes his seat in the temple.[2] This passage is normally related to Ez. 28:2 and Is. 14:13f., where in the Ez. passage the prophecy against the king of Tyre says, Τάδε λέγει κύριος 'Ανθ' ὧν ὑφώθη σου ἡ καρδία, καὶ εἶπας θεός εἰμι ἐγώ, κατοικίαν θεοῦ κατῴκηκα ἐν καρδίᾳ θαλάσσης. Both Matt. 24:5 par. and II Thess. 2:4 have the theme of pretension to deity which can easily be traced through the apocalyptic tradition and is related to Daniel.[3]

---

1 For a survey of this material see Rigaux, pp. 253-273.

2 Rigaux, p. 661, Frame, p. 256, and all other commentators.

3 The point here which is most striking is that these pretensions are related first to historical persons, and then that this becomes a stylized means of describing enemies and tyrants.
Isaiah 14:13 - The King of Babylon
Ezekiel 28:2 - The King of Tyre
Daniel 11:36 - Antiochus Epiphanes
II Macc. 9:1-12 - Antiochus Epiphanes
Josephus, Ant. XVII, 169 - Herod Herod's disease was attributed to his impiety. The same idea comes out in the death of Antiochus, I Macc. 6:13, II Macc. 9:5f.
Ps. Sol. 2:30,-33-35 - Pompey
Acts 12:23 - Herod
Yet in Mk. 13:6,21,22 the pretentions of false Christs are not historicized, nor is the beast who utters haughty and blasphemous words in Apoc. 13:5. The Man of Lawlessness in II Thess. 2:3 fits this second pattern. He is a mythical end-time figure.

This is the key point at which the Danielic references in both the synoptic apocalypse and II Thess. come together most concretely.[1] However, there is one interesting relationship between Dan. 9:27, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων ἔσται ἕως. . . , Matt. 24:15, and II Thess. 2:4. This revolves around the word temple. Matt. 24:15 couples the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως with τόπος ἅγιος. Dan. 9:27 has βδέλυγμα with ἱερὸν. II Thess. has the Man of Lawlessness seating himself in the temple, ναός. The τόπὸς ἅγιος is another term for the temple.[3] All three passages have temple. Two passages have the abomination of desolation, one passage has the Man of Lawlessness, who is described in terms taken from another part of Daniel, Dan. 11:36. Here we can see how the mythical, end-time figure of the Man of Lawlessness has moved in to replace the abomination of desolation. II Thess, stands, along with Did. 16:4-5[4] between the synoptic apocalypse and the Apocalypse of John.[5]

---

1 Hartman, pp. 197-200 spells the argument out in detail.

2 The LXX is more concrete than the MT at this point. The MT has שָׁם, while the LXX makes it concrete with ἱερόν.

3 בַּיִת comes to be a term for the tabernacle/temple, Deut. 12:5,14; Is. 18:7; Ps. 24:3; etc. In the LXX this comes to be τόπός or τόπὸς ἅγιος.

4 Cf. infra, p. 93.

5 The time scale is secondary to the interpretation scale. Its not <u>when</u> II Thess. was written, but <u>the stage</u> in development. The beast of Apoc. 13 is the expanded form of Did. 16:4-5, and II Thess. 2:3-4.

88

II Thess. 2:7

τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη
ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας

Matt. 24:12

καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι
τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται
ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν

This relationship is that of an idea, i.e. the effect, the activity of lawlessness. Yet what makes this relationship plausible is that ἀνομία is only found in Matt., and not in Mk. and Lk.

II Thess. 2:9-10

οὗ ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ'
ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐν
πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις
καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους καὶ
ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας
τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, ἀνθ'
ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς
ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο
εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς.

Matt. 24:24

ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδό-
χριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται
καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα
μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα, ὥστε
πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ
τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

Matt. 24:12-13

ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν
πολλῶν. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας
εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.

This relationship is also that of ideas, but specifically the words σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα , and σωθῆναι bind these passages together. "Signs and wonders" relate to the deception of believers and the leading of them astray. In the synoptics, "signs and wonders" only occur in Matt. 24:24 and Mk. 13:22.

For Paul "signs and wonders" are the credentials of a

true apostle, Rom. 15:19, II Cor. 12:12. In II Thess 2:9 they are the "signs" used by the "Man of Lawlessness" to deceive, and of course deception is the point in Matt. 24:24, Mk. 13:22.

In Matt. 24:12-13 there are pseudo-prophets who will lead many astray, but no signs and wonders. However, immediately following this is the Matt. 24:13/Mk. 13:13 parallel about those who will be saved. In II Thess. 2:9-10 there are the same items.

II Thess. 2:8-9	Matt. 24:12,24
The revelation of the lawless one.	pseudo-Christs and pseudo-prophets
II Thess 2:9	Matt. 24:24
signs and wonders	signs and wonders
II Thess. 2:10	Matt. 24:13
not receive salvation	receive salvation

In these passages we can see the figure of the lawless one, who is moved by the activity of Satan, has displaced the false-Christs, and false prophets. Both are deceivers, and the end product is salvation for those who resist, or the loss of salvation for those who follow, either the false-Christs, or the lawless one. Here again we have a bridge to the Apoc. In Apoc. 13 the beast does signs, vss. 13,14. It calls forth endurance on the part of the saints, vs. 10, cf. Matt. 24:13.

<u>The Relationships Between II Thess. and Didache 16.</u>

90

The apocalyptic conclusion to the Didache, not only furnishes many points of contact with II Thess., but it also shows the combination of synoptic apocalypse terminology and material from II Thess.[1] By examining the whole of Did. 16, we will be in a better position to assess its relationships to II Thess.

Did. 16:1a	I Thess. 5:6
Γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν	ἀλλὰ γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν
	Matt. 24:42/Mk. 13:35
	γρηγορεῖτε οὖν ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται.

Did. begins with a warning about watchfulness. The verb γρηγορεῖν is common to all these passages, and it seems to be the traditional way to begin this kind of teaching.[2]

Did. 16:1b	Luke 12:35
οἱ λύχνοι ὑμῶν μὴ σβεσθήτωσαν, καὶ αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν	Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι καὶ οἱ λύχνοι

---

1 By this we do not mean to imply that Did. 16 is a combination of II Thess. and Matt. 24. Rather, Did. 16 is an expression of the common, early-Christian teaching about the last things. Did. 16 shows another way in which this traditional material is used and adapted.

2 As we shall see later p.100, the element of watchful waiting is absent in II Thess. because it is the author's purpose to play down and overcome the enthusiasm of expectation.

91

μὴ ἐκλυέσθωσαν, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, <u>οὐ γὰρ οἴδατε τὴν ὥραν, ἐν ᾗ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται</u>.

καιόμενοι <u>ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται</u>.

The opening call to watchfulness in Did. 16:1 is a cluster of traditional images from the same tradition as the synoptic apocalypse, the parables on watching and waiting, and the tradition behind I Thess. 5.

Did. 16:2

πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε ζητοῦντες τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν, <u>οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν</u>, ἐὰν μὴ <u>ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ</u> τελειωθῆτε.

Barnabas 4:9

διὸ προσέχωμεν <u>ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις</u>, <u>οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν</u>

This parallelism does not relate to II Thess., but it does point out the traditional character of the Did. material. The importance for our argument is that at every point, Did. 16 is composed of traditional material taken from the common early-Christian teaching on eschatology.[1]

---

1 J.P. Audet, <u>La Didaché Instructions des Apôtres</u> (1958), p. 162 concludes that the Barnabas quotation is secondary to that of the Didache, yet he reserves the possibility, "que la Didachiste ait lui-même emprunté la substance de son exhortation finale à une source qui aurait pu venir à la connaissance de Barnabé par une voie indépendente."

92

Whether Barnabas borrowed this quotation from Didache, or whether B' found it in the early-Christian teaching on eschatology, the important point is to notice how various elements are handled and developed. Barnabas is using apocalyptic material in Ch. 4 to make an ethical argument, however, the images and the texts used are very specific, i.e. Enoch, Daniel.

The parallel between Did. 16:2 and Barn. 4:9 is more than a simple borrowing by Barn. from the Did., if this is the case, for Bar. uses the parallel in relationship to specific apocalyptic texts, which relate to the early-Christain teaching on the last things. But these related texts are not found in Didache 16.

Barnabas is a good example of how the traditional images, texts, and sayings of the apocalyptic tradition are preserved, but re-combined, and even reinforced with direct O.T. quotations in order to meet the needs of another time and another situation.

Did. 16:3-4

ἐν γὰρ ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ οἱ φθορεῖς, καὶ στραφήσονται τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος. αὐξανούσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας μισήσουσιν

Matt 24:11-12

καὶ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλούς, καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν.

Matt. 24:24

ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται

ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσι καὶ παραδώσουσι, καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλανὴς ὡς υἱὸς Θεοῦ, καὶ ποιήσει σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, καὶ ἡ γῆ παραδοθήσεται εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιήσει ἀθέμιτα, ἃ οὐδέποτε γέγονεν ἐξ αἰῶνος

καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα, ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

II Thess. 2:3, 8-10
ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, 2:8 ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος . . . οὗ ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ'ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανὰ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας . . .

What we have here is a parallelism of ideas. There is no verbal dependance, and we can see that the three authors feel free to use their material as it suits their purposes, and not in any prescribed manner.

In Did. 16:3-4 there are the following elements: false prophets, love changing to hate, unlawfulness, the coming of a deceiver with the pretentions of deity, and this deceiver authenticates himself with signs and wonders. If we look at the Matt. 24 material, and the II Thess. material all these same elements appear: false prophets, Matt. 24:11,24, love changing, Matt. 24:12, the coming of a deceiver with the pretentions of deity, II Thess. 2:3, 8, and the deceiver, II Thess. 2:9-10, false prophets, Matt. 24:24, authenticates

himself with signs and wonders, II Thess. 2:9,10, Matt. 24:24.

What these parallels indicate is a common tradition out of which one author picked certain items, and another author picked other items. When these items are compared with Apoc. 13, and the activity of the beast, we can also see the growth of the tradition. Apocalyptic seems to grow without losing any of its original elements.

The combination of items in Matt. 24, and II Thess 2, which appear in Did. 16:3-4 show that Matt. and II Thess. at these points are much closer together than one would imagine. The way in which Did. uses the traditional material, and the fact that we do not have any verbal parallelism, argues against the idea that Did. 16 is merely the combination of Matt. and II Thess.[1]

Did. 16:5	Matt. 24:10
τότε ἥξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας, καὶ σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται ὑπ'	καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοί. . .
	Matt. 10:22
	ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.
	Matt. 24:13
	ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος,

1 Audet, pp. 180-181 shows that such an idea is wrong because of the fragmentary way Did. handles the gospel tradition.

αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος. οὗτος σωθήσεται

Again the close relationship between Did. and Matt. 24 appears. However, the appearance of the word πύρωσις points out the traditional attitude of apocalyptic writing. Emilie Sander[1] has shown that πύρωσις here in Did. 16:5, and in I Peter 4:12, preserves a very precise apocalyptic concept, i.e. the time of testing and trial which takes place prior to the eschatological consummation. This same idea is mentioned in Matt. 24:5-14, where people must go through trials, "many will fall away," but, "he who endures to the end will be saved."

When we look at II Thess. it is important to see the distinction between the ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς, δίδοντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν θεὸν, II Thess. 2:8 and the concept of πύρωσις in Did. 16:5, and I Pet. 4:12. In II Thess. we are dealing with images which are associated with the destruction of the wicked by the Lord Jesus, who comes with his angels. In Did. 16:5 we are dealing with the trials and tribulations which come upon "the creation of mankind" leading up to the return of the Lord Jesus.[2]

---

1 E. Sander, ΠΥΡΩΣΙΣ (1967), shows that the background of the word πύρωσις in I Peter 4:12, and likewise for Did. 16:5, is a technical term found at Qumran, מצרף , 1QS 1:17, 8:4; 1QM 17:9; 1QH 5:16; 4Qp Ps. 37, 2:19; 4Q Fl 2:1. At Qumran this term means a test, or a trial, and generally, eschatological testing, i.e. the final ordeal before, or at judgement. Sander argues that this term מצרף is the concept and word behind πύρωσις in I Peter 4:12. However, in I Peter 4:12 the word πύρωσις itself is not a technical term, as it must be modified to preserve the concept of testing, πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμόν.

2 The same images, words, and time table which we have in II Thess. 1:8, 2:8, can be found in IV Ezra 13:25-28.

Did. 16:6	I Thess 4:16
καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας, πρῶτον σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ, εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.	ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ. . .
	Matt. 24:30
	καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ. . . 24:31 μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης. . . καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ.

In Did. 16:6 the three signs of the parousia are: the sign spread out in heaven, the trumpet, and the resurrection of the dead. The same three are found in Matt. 24:30, the sign (of the Son of Man) in heaven, the trumpet, and the gathering of the elect. I Thess. 4:16 has only two of these three signs, the trumpet and the resurrection.

This part of the common tradition, i.e. the signs pointing to the end, are not found in II Thess., because this author wants to concentrate on the fact that the κοσμοπλανής the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας , with his pretension to deity, has not yet arrived upon the scene.

Did. 16:7-8	II Thess. 1:7
οὐ πάντων δὲ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐρρέθη, Ἥξει ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.	ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν	Matt. 24:30
κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω	καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.	ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ
	τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης
	πολλῆς

Didache 16:7-8 uses the material which goes back to Daniel 7, the Son of Man passage, without using the title Son of Man. We can see the same thing happening in the II Thess. 1:7 passage. Here the reference to the powerful angels and the revelation from heaven reflect the Son of Man material in the synoptic apocalypse, but the title is not used. Like Did., II Thess. 1:7 used the title Lord. This three way tie up between Did., Matt., and II Thess. places II Thess. 1:7b-10 into the framework of the early Christian teaching on eschatology.[1]

A Description of the Material in II Thessalonians

That II Thess. has material which is related to the synoptic apocalypse and the Didache is now manifest, and this is no new observation.[2] However, the question which is

---

1 We do not have to go as far as Dibelius, Comm., p. 42, in locating the source for this section. Dibelius finds, "Dieser eine biblische Assoziation mit der anderen verbendende Text ist offenbar aus jüdischem Material, der Schilderung einer Gerichtstheophanie - vielleicht in einem liturgischen Gebet -, gebildet und durch Einschiebungen verchristlicht."

2 Cf. P. Vielhauer, "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity,"

98

of importance for our argument is that of how this early-Christian apocalyptic teaching is used by the author of II Thess.

In our analysis of the literary relationships between I and II Thess., cf. Ch. 3, we noted that there were three sections in II Thess. where the parallels between I and II Thess. either stopped altogether or were changed in type. These three sections were II Thess. 1:7b-10, 2:3b-5, 2:7-12. As we have seen above, these sections are also related to each other and are based upon a rather definite set of eschatological teachings from the early church.

The primary evidence for this continuity between II Thess. Chs. 1 and 2 is: (1) the Son of Man language in II Thess. 1:7b, and (2) the Danielic references in Chs. 1 and 2, i.e. the interchange of Son of Man for the Lord Jesus, the flames of fire, cf. Dan. 7:9,11, and the pretension to diety, 2:4, cf. Dan. 11:36. When we find material so closely related to the same apocalyptic tradition as are these passages (II Thess. 1:7b, 2:3b-4, 7-12), and when they are virtually back to back, the only possible conclusion is that the author is using a common source for all three.[1]

(n. 2, p. 97, cont.)
New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher (1965), II, 627-28, Hartman, pp. 178ff., and Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future (1954), pp. 232ff.

1 This is not necessarily a written source. More likely it is a loose body of material, gathered about some definite points, which were the standard teaching on eschatology. If it were not so how could the author of II Thess. make such a definite appeal to it, in II Thess. 2:5-6?

99

This analysis becomes even more convincing when we see that the material itself carries the author from 1:7b-10, instead of the author using and adapting the material as in 2:1-3. At the end of 1:5 we read, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε. The next phrase, εἴπερ δίκαιον παρὰ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν, is meant as a phrase of comfort. The whole apocalyptic piece which follows this phrase is a kind of proof text. It just runs on and on until it stops abruptly with, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Then the author reaches back and picks up the tone and the structure of the thanksgiving-prayer. The break between 1:10 and 1:11 is sharp, almost as if the author were saying, "proved."

Another indication that the author is reproducing traditional material in 1:7b-10 is the fact that the O.T. allusions are presented in the same contexts as are found in the O.T.,[1] and not in the contexts they have in I Thess. Of course we have to make room for the possibility that the O.T. allusions in I Thess. "triggered" the whole use of the traditional apocalyptic material. Certainly this becomes much more plausible when we remember that several items common to this material are imbedded in I Thess. 4:13ff.

In describing this II Thess. material it becomes important to observe just what is included and excluded, when we compare it with I Thess., Matt. 24/par., and Did. 16. What stands out immediately is the fact that Did. 16, Matt. 24/par., and I Thess. 4,5, all have the signs of the end, i.e. the sign

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 72.

in the heavens, the trumpet, and the resurrection of the dead/ gathering of the elect. II Thess. has none of these. Here we only find the revelation of the Lord Jesus, and then a great deal of material about what he is going to do, judging and punishing his enemies. In the other three sources there are urgent exhortations to endure in view of the coming trials.

Certainly there is a scaling down of the urgency, and the concept of the proximity of the end from I Thess. to Mark, to Matt., to Luke, and to the Didache. I Thess. 4:17 shows that Paul expects Jesus in his own lifetime. Mark urges watchfulness for the exact time of the end is not known, Mk. 13:37. Both Matt. and Luke change the Marcan outline and teaching from something private to something open. They both emphasize in different ways the interim period and the delay of the parousia.[1] Didache uses all the words of watching and waiting, but the actual end is seen as remote, for it urges people to preserve their souls the whole time of their faith. However, in I Thess., Matt. 24/par., and Did. 16 there is no stress on what is going to happen when Jesus returns.[2]

The important point to see in this material is that II Thess. and the other three are not dealing with different materials, but with different questions. In I Thess., Matt.

---

1 Vielhauer, pp. 617-18.

2 The Georgian translation, and the text of the Seventh Book of the Apostolic Constitutions both add a statement at the end of the Did. that Jesus will judge mankind and requite the Devil. Cf. Vielhauer, p. 628, Audet, p. 73, and G. Peradse, "Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in der georgischen Überlieferung," ZNW 31 (1932), pp. 111-16.

101

24/par., and Did. 16, the emphasis is upon watching and waiting faithfully, and the signs of the end, when faithfulness will be vindicated in the coming of the Lord. Here the question is, when will the Lord come? In II Thess. the emphasis is upon what the Lord will do when he comes, i.e. inflict vengenance 1:8, slay the lawless one, 2:8. The question being asked here is [1], have any of these things happened?

We also need to see what material is from the tradition and what material is from the author of II Thess. II Thess. 1:7b-10, 2:3b-4, 7-12 has already been demonstrated to be traditional, in that it is directly related to the early-Christian apocalyptic teaching, and because the sentence structure in the three pieces, with their preponderance of subordinate clauses, run on and on, as if the author were quoting, for he reproduces something in a different style, than his own.

---

1 The arguments about two totally different views on eschatology between I and II Thess. fall to the ground when we see how the early-Christian apocalyptic teaching is used in both epistles. It is not the material or the argument which is different. It is the question being asked. Where II Thess. and the other Pauline letters part, comes at the point of the question itself. In the other letters, Paul just does not dwell upon the question of what Jesus will do to sinners when he returns, cf. I Cor. 15:25.

Thus when Masson, Comm., pp. 9-13, builds a case for the inauthenticity of II Thess. on the divergency of apocalyptic teaching, "Saint Paul a donné à l' occasion un enseignement eschatologique, ainsi qu' en temoignent I Thess. 4:13 à 5:11; I Cor. 15; mais l' enseignement eschatologique de II Thess. 2:1-12 qu' on voudrait lui attribuer est se incompatible avec son enseignement eschatologique qu' on ne sait où l' y introduire.", he fails, because he does not see how the apocalyptic material is being used.

Masson needs to ask the question, does the issue with which II Thess. deals, arise during the life time of Paul?

Parallels with Matt. 24 also appear in II Thess. 2:1-3[1] but they are moulded and adapted to fit the situation of the letter, by the author. In this passage the pronouns are in the second person, and the situation is made concrete by reference to a letter, 2:2b, and the disturbances in the Thessalonian community.

The ὅτι clause which concludes 2:3 and runs to the end of 2:4, has the same character as the 1:7b-10 piece, and it seems to carry the author, rather than being adapted by the author.

II Thess. 2:5,6 relate to I Thess. 3:4[2] and here the second person pronoun is used again to adapt further the traditional material to the local situation.

II Thess. 2:7-12 resumes the style of the traditional material, with its long sentences and numerous dependent clauses.[3]

The author of II Thess. chose his material with a certain purpose in mind. He did not want references to the signs of the end, but there is no way of knowing the author's understanding of what was in or out of the traditional material. However, it does not appear likely that he did much adapting of material

---

1 Cf. supra, p. 78ff.

2 Cf. supra, p. 57.

3 This style is similar to the creedal style of Rom. 1:2-4; I Tim. 3:16; Ign. Eph. 13:2; Smy. 1:1-2. The author of II Thess. is probably reproducing material from memory which was part of a common catechetical tradition.

103

in the three sections, 1:7b-10, 2:3b-4,7-12, because of their continuity and style.

The origin of this traditional material is another question which only relates indirectly to our consideration of the structure and purpose of I[I] Thess.[1]

The Author's Argument in the Apocalyptic Section

In our attempt to come to an understanding of the structure and purpose of II Thess. we have seen: (1) that II Thess. is built upon the epistolary outline of I Thess. using it in a rather stilted and mechanical way, (2) that there are numerous literary relationships between I and II Thess., and these relationships are lacking in the apocalyptic sections of II Thess., and (3) that the apocalyptic sections of II Thess. are intimately connected with a specific early-Christian apocalyptic tradition.

Now we need to consider the specific argument the author

---

1 There is no question about the Jewish apocalyptic background of this material, and its relationship to the O.T. Rigaux, p. 624 gives ample evidence for the parallels. Further there is no question about the development of this material from a primitive outline into a full-blown apocalypse. This can easily be seen in the development from the simple outline of I Thess. 4 and 5 to the very intricate staging of the Apocalypse of John.

As to the origin of the original apocalyptic kernel which began this process there is no positive proof. Hartman, pp. 245ff. would like to trace it back to Jesus himself. Vielhauer, pp. 609-10 gives a convincing account of how an early prophet spoke a "Word of the living Lord," and Vielhauer sets this within a description of the role apocalypticism played in the early church.

104

of II Thess. is making with this material. II Thess. 1:7b-10 is used as a kind of proof text. The main argument is that of time. When will the afflictor be afflicted, and the afflicted receive rest, 1:6-7a? This happens, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει, 1:7b-10. This section not only answers the question of time, but it also gives a glimpse of the kind of punishment in store for the afflictors. This promise of punishment is meant to strengthen the will and resistance of the ones being afflicted, and give an answer to the underlying question of theodicy. Yet this particular theme is not picked up by the author in 1:11. The point the author is making is a temporal one, when not how, with regard to vindication and punishment.

This argument about time is reinforced when we come to 2:1-3. This is a section where there is common material with Matt. 24/par., but it is re-written to apply to the Thess. themselves.

The time structure of this passage revolves about the phrase, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. The ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν is the equivalent of the ὡς of subjective reason with a participial complement.[1] This contains the main idea the author is trying to counter, i.e. ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. The author of II Thess. argues that the Day of the Lord οὐκ ἐνέστηκεν, and to this end he marshalls his apocalyptic proof texts. The exact meaning of this verb brings the time element around which the apocalyptic section revolves, into

---

1 Blass, Debrunner, Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament (1961), #396, p. 203.

focus.

The perfect, ἐνέστηκεν has the sense of a present.[1] In our text the meaning is,"to have entered," hence "to be present."[2] Opinion is divided as to whether this means that the Day of the Lord is imminent,[3] or that it has started.[4] But in reality these two positions are virtually the same. There is only a hair's difference between the person who believes that the "end" is so close as to be virtually here, and the person who believes that the very first signs of the end-time process have appeared.[5] Certainly the author of II Thess. is not arguing against the idea that the Day of the Lord is present in its fullness, for he does not ask if Jesus is here, but he points out that the Man of Lawlessness has not yet appeared on the scene. Before Jesus can come, the lawless one has to arrive, II Thess. 2:3.[6] Further, Rigaux rightly points out that there is a difference between the imminence meant in passages such as Rom. 13:12 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν, Phil. 4:5

---

1 Ibid., s.v. #391.

2 A. Oepke, "ἐνίστημι," TWNT, ad, loc.

3 Ibid., "Since there is no question of a spiritualizing error, the present perf. has a fut. significance, "in process of coming."

4 Neil, Comm., p. 159, "The sense in which the Day of the Lord is already here, is, of course, not that the Son of Man has appeared, but that the period of time signified by the word "Day" has begun, and that now at any moment the crisis may be upon them."

5 For a survey of this debate and literature, cf. Rigaux, pp. 652f.

6 Ibid.

106

ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς and our passage in II Thess. 2:2. This difference becomes even more clear when we see that in Rom. 8:38 the participle ἐνεστῶτα is used for the present in contrast to μέλλοντα , which is clearly future. So if ἐνέστηκεν in II Thess. 2:2 means imminent, it means imminent in a different sense than the normal Pauline way of referring to the shortness of time.

If the "Day" is not complete, and if the meaning of ἐνέστηκεν is that the "Day" is in the "process of coming," which is to say virtually here, then the debate over the precise meaning of ἐνέστηκεν comes to be "much ado about nothing."

With respect to those who are waiting to hear the sound of a bell, what is the difference between the time when the sexton flexes his muscles to pull on the bell rope, and the point in time when he actually starts down with the rope? One is imminent and the other has begun, but with respect to the hearers, the ringing of the bell in a brief second or two is assurred.

The author of II Thess. has adapted the traditional beginning of this early-Christian teaching on the παρουσία to his readers, and then tells his readers not to believe that the Day of the Lord ἐνέστηκεν even if this assurance seems to come from an authority, i.e. by spirit, cf. I Cor. 12:8-11, by word, cf. I Cor. 14:6-33, or letter. This group of three, spirit, word, and letter seems to be a general summary of the means used to convey knowledge or information

107

about "that Day."

The readers are not to be deceived, because the author proves to them through another apocalyptic proof text that "that Day" is not on the scene, ἐνέστηκεν , for the first sign/event has not taken place, i.e. the apostasy, the Man of Lawlessness.

The author reinforces this teaching by asking the readers to remember the teaching of Paul, whennhe was with them. These two verses, II Thess. 2:5,6 are adapted to the situation of the readers, but after the mysterious reference to τὸ κατέχον , cf. the following chapter, the style in 2:7 shifts back to the long involved sentences, and the author appears again to be reproducing a source. This material ends abruptly in 2:12.

The major theme in all this apocalyptic material is the time of the parousia. The readers are shown conclusively that the parousia is not here, not even close, for certain elements preceeding "that Day" have not yet taken place. The interesting point is that the author is using apocalyptic material as proof texts to show that apocalyptic enthusiasm about the presence or proximity of the end is mistaken.

A secondary theme of this argument concerns comfort in the face of persecution. There is no question that the author includes more material about the punishment and predestination of sinner for punishment, than was necessary to make the point against the proximity of the parousia.

At this point we can see the divergent use of apocalyptic

108

material in I and II Thess. I Thess. emphasizes the proximity of the parousia and the need to watch and wait. II Thess. emphasizes the distance of the parousia, and God's eventual judgment and punishment of sinners. This latter theme never appears, expressed in these apocalyptic terms, in the other Pauline letters. Perhaps this was the only time such a question came up for Paul? Perhaps this was a question of the next generation?

CHAPTER V

TO KATEXON - O KATEXΩN

Purpose

This famous crux interpretum must comfort the author of Ecclesiastes for truly no better description can be found regarding the research on this problem than:

> "What has been is what will be,
> and what has been done
> is what will be done;
> and there is nothing new under the sun"
>
> Eccl. 1:9 RSV

We all hope to calm the great storm of ignorance, but more realistically, this chapter purposes to set this problem in perspective, and to see how it functions in this epistle. Perhaps we can cast a little more light upon it, and see more clearly the extent to which the author is using his material to focus upon the rejection of the idea that the Day of the Lord, is dawning.

The Problem Itself

There is little comfort in admitting that St. Augustine has the copyright on the "latest" findings on this subject. "I admit that I am completely at a loss as to his meaning. Nevertheless, I will not refrain from mentioning such suggestions as I have been able to hear or read."[1] Vielhauer writes

in 1964, "The identity of ὁ κατέχων is uncertain . . . On the assumption of spuriousness, we must go on to say that the change in gender (τό - ὁ) is an intentional veiling, and thus an apocalyptic stylistic feature."[2]

In the centuries between the author of II Thess. and the present, all kinds of brilliant solutions have been proposed for this problem.[3] The ancient exegetes have set the limits outside of which no one has been able to move. These limits are understood in modern terms as the historical and the mythical interpretations.

The historical interpretation seeks to identify ὁ κατέχων with either an historical person, or an historical reality. Tertullian[4] seems to be the first to do this. After quoting this section of II Thess. he says, "What obstacle is there but the Roman state, the falling away of which, by being scattered into ten kingdoms, shall introduce Antichrist."[5] John Chrysostom (Hom. 6 on II Thess.) takes the same view.

In modern times the historical view finds many adherents

---

1 (from previous page) Augustine, De Civ. Dei, XX, 19; ed. and tr., W.,Greene, LCL (1950), p. 361.

2 Vielhauer, pp. 614-615.

3 The most exhaustive survey of the research on this problem is Bornemann, Die Thessalonicherbriefe (1894), pp. 400-459. Rigaux brings this survey up to date, pp. 259ff., cf. also Hartman, p. 196, n.18.

4 A. Strobel, Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem (1961), pp. 137-140 deals with this problem.

5 Tert., de Ress. XXIV; tr. ANF, III, 563.

111

and candidates for ὁ κατέχων . Beginning with Hugo Grotius, Rigaux notes, "Pour lui et ses successeurs, II Thess. 2:1-12 doit être interprété à la lumiere des événements contemporains."[1] From Grotius to the present many interesting and imaginative combinations of emperors, procurators, and personages have been combined and used to unlock the riddle of ὁ κατέχων .

In present day exegesis the historical view has been chastened,[2] and advocates use a more quiet apprpach. Stauffer seems to equate the restraining power of the state, with the function of ὁ κατέχων .[3] Following Stauffer, Leon Morris suggests, "Better than any of these speculations seems to be that which favors the principle of order which restrains the working of evil."[4] Yet Morris hastens to add that no one really

---

1 Rigaux, p. 263.

2 Not so with F.F. Bruce, "Christianity under Claudius," BJRL 44 (1961-62), p. 323. "There are few N.T. passages which can boast such a variety of interpretation as this; but its life-setting and meaning have always seemed fairly clear to me. The predicted personal "abomination of desolation, standing where he ought not" (Mk 13:14) must have appeared to many to be on the point of emerging when Gaius in A.D. 40 ordered the erection of his image in the Jerusalem temple." This is the latest in the long line of historical identification, and most all of them rest upon the same intuitive clarity which comes from lining up prophecies and fullfillments.

3 E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology (1955), p. 85, "The N.T. recognizes the peculiar greatness but also the hidden tragedy of political life. The civil power is set up as a bulwark against the power of chaos, but it can only keep these powers in check, never really subdue them. The fight against them will never come to an end, and in the end it must succumb to their final onslaught (II Thess. 2:7f.)."

4 Morris, p. 226.

112

knows what ὁ κατέχων refers to.

Thus, the historical interpretation which began with Tertullian, while enjoying the labor of great men, has run its course, and can only be defended on the basis of, "The principle of order which restrains the working of evil." The major objection to the historical interpretation, and to the identification of ὁ κατέχων with the Roman empire is that this would be the only political-historical reference, not only in this passage, but also in all of Paul's apocalyptic sections.[1]

The mythological interpretation of ὁ κατέχων was also known to the church fathers. Chrysostom says, "What then is it that withholdeth, that is, hindereth him from being revealed? Some indeed say, the grace of the Spirit, but others the Roman empire, to whom I must of all accede."[2] Besides the Holy Spirit, later commentators have identified ὁ κατέχων with angels, with heavenly beings such as Elijah, or with a divine plan or time table.

Gunkel[3] showed the mythological background of the passage and opened the way for later commentators, such as Dibelius to analyze the passage in terms of its apocalyptic and mythological background. Neil[4] following the work of

---

1 Frame, p. 260.

2 In II Thess. 2:6-9, Hom. IV; tr, NPNF, Ser. 1, XIII, 388.

3 H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit (1895), pp. 223ff.

4 Neil, Comm. p. 172.

113

Dibelius concludes, "He (Paul) introduces a feature of current eschatological expectation . . . This mysterious figure, this vice-regent of the Evil One, is a personification of traditional mythology,"

The major criticism of those who want to see ὁ κατέχων as a mythological figure, is not the mythological background of the passage and the images presented, but the fact that this method of investigation leads only to another question mark. If it is mythological, then what is it? No one has been able to define it precisely.

Within these two general approaches, the historical and the mythological, there are also certain compromises or oblique solutions. Schaefer,[1] understands κατέχειν intransitively, and asks the question, "Who is holding sway?" It is Satan. He rules this age, until he ἐκ μέσου γένηται.[2] Schaefer understands this as the removal of Satan. The question which is probed is the meaning of κατέχειν . Schaefer's solution is attractive except it requires an exegete's mind to distinguish between τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων, and it seems unlikely that Satan's removal would then make way for the lawless one.

An attempt at a compromise between the historical and the mythological was recently made by Johannes Munck,

---

1 A. Schaefer, Die Bücher des Neuen Testaments (1890), pp. 158-66.

2 Ibid., p. 165.

114

following the thesis of O. Cullmann.[1] Τὸ κατέχον is the preaching of the gospel mentioned in Mk. 13:10. When the gospel is preached in all the world, then the end will come. The gospel restrains, delays, and who is the one who restrains? It is the apostle Paul, himself. Thus the mythological, God's plan, is combined with an historical person, Paul.

Rigaux,[2] has commented upon the weaknesses of this argument. He points out that if Paul preached this kind of a scheme, then how could the Thessalonians have believed that the Day of the Lord was at hand? Conversly, if Paul had not mentioned the salvation-history aspect of ὁ κατέχων then the Thessalonians would have had to be spectacular exegetes to find it there.

Prat[3] poses the question of whether the search for ὁ κατέχων has been in the right direction. He wants to limit the search to the specific apocalyptic background of the passage. However, his method is probably more important than his conclusions. He goes rapidly to Daniel and identifies ὁ κατέχων with the angel Michael.

In summary, the problem of ὁ κατέχων revolves about several points: (1) the background out of which the passage

---

1 J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (1959), pp. 37ff., follows O. Cullmann, "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de saint Paul," RHP 16 (1936), pp. 210-245.

2 Rigaux, p. 276.

3 F. Prat, La Théologie de Saint Paul (1961), p. 98.

comes, (2) the use of κατέχειν , transitively, or intransitively, (3) the meaning of ἐκ μέσου γένηται , (4) the relationship between ὁ κατέχων and the Man of Lawlessness.

The Meaning of Κατέχειν .

The question about the meaning of this verb does not arise because it can be used in many ways, but the question arises over two specific meanings. The issue comes down to this:[1] do we understand the verb to mean "hold fast" as in I Thess. 5:21, "Hold fast to the good," or do we understand the verb to mean "hold back" as in Philemon 13, ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν κατέχειν.

Since both the transitive and intransitive meanings of the verb are so widely attested in the literature, the decision for II Thess. comes down to the matter of context.

The argument for the intransitive use of κατέχειν has to proceed in this manner. In II Thess. 2:5 the author reminds the readers that he has previously told them that the Man of Lawlessness must be revealed and claim divinity. Then we have the phrase, καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε . The καὶ νῦν should be seen as a temporal conjunction, contrasting the present with the things previously mentioned. It would be very difficult to ask the readers to remember something,

---

1 For a survey of the use of this word cf. W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (1957), s.v. κατέχειν , and G. Milligan, St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians (1908), pp. 154ff. where his note on κατέχειν sets out more than ample evidence for the use of the two meanings in question.

and then see the καὶ νῦν as a logical conjunction, telling them that they now know ὁ κατέχων , implying that ὁ κατέχων equals the things they were to remember. Further there does not appear to be any disjunctive idea in this conjunction for it is καί and not δέ . This καὶ νῦν contrasts the previous things, which were in the future, with the present thing, ὁ κατέχων .[1]

Using κατέχειν intransitively, we would say, "and as to the present, you know the (thing, force, power) holding sway over the world." This fits well until we come to the next phrase, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ . What does the αὐτόν refer to? Is it ὁ κατέχων , or the Man of Lawlessness? It seems rather plain that it must be the Man of Lawlessness, for ὁ κατέχων is the present force, and the Man of Lawlessness is in the future. The time element of the infinitive phrase εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι is certainly future.

In the next verse, II Thess. 2:7, the first phrase seems to be understood by a Qumran parallel, the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας. In contrast to God's mysteries, which are, "His plan for the universe and history,"[2] there are also "the mysteries of sin," (1QH 5:36, 1Q27, 1:2, 1QM 14:9) which "refer to the hidden activity of the evil powers,"[3]

---

1 Frame, p. 262; Hanse, "Κατέχειν," **TWNT**, ad. loc.

2 H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, (1963), p. 60, also R. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion," Biblica 39 (1958), pp. 434ff.

3 Ringgren, p. 61.

117

The "plan of lawlessness" the "hidden activity of evil" is already at work. This is the same time contrast between the present, hidden activity, and the future time of revelation. Now comes the crucial phrase, μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως . . . The adverb μόνον acts as a conjunction, leading to an explanation as to why the power of lawlessness is hidden, and not manifest. Why? because the one now holding power, (intransitive) holds power until ἐκ μέσου γένηται . Something happens to the holding power, either it is removed, or it stands aside.

In II Thess. 2:8 there is another switch in time sequence, and we are right back parallel with 2:3,4, talking about the revelation of the lawless one. After the power which rules this present time, stands aside/is removed, "then the lawless one shall be revealed."

This intransitive use of κατέχειν works fine until we try to give it some specific content. If we identify ὁ κατέχων with Satan, or a representative of Satan, then Satan who holds power over this world, must either stand aside, or be removed before the lawless one can appear. On the other hand if we identify ὁ κατέχων with God or one of His representatives, then we are in the curious position of having God in control of the world, either being removed or standing aside so that the lawless one can appear.

However, if we take κατέχειν transitively, and see the meaning related to a "holding" or "hindering" force, then we get a schema something like this. The author reminds the readers of the teaching that the man of lawless-

118

ness must come first, and as for the present they know what thing restrains him, holds him back, so that he can be revealed in his own time. The hidden activity of lawlessness is already at work, only the one who now restrains (the lawless one?) restrains (him?) until he (the restrainer) is either removed or stands aside. Then the lawless one will be revealed.

When we put some kind of content into κατέχειν it becomes reasonable in the context. Of course, it only becomes reasonable if the content is positive and not negative. It would seem rather strange to have Satan restraining the Man of Lawlessness, and then describe his coming as wrought through the activity of Satan, II Thess. 2:9.

In this context the most resonable solution is that κατέχειν must be taken transitively, meaning to restrain, hold in check, hold back, and that the agent of this restraint must be positive, opposed to the Man of Lawlessness.

The Meaning of ἐκ μέσου γένηται.

This little phrase is most important for an understanding of ὁ κατέχων because it describes the kind of a person ὁ κατέχων is. What does this phrase mean with respect to the action of ὁ κατέχων ? If this phrase means, "to be taken out of the way," then ὁ κατέχων cannot be more than a secondary person, plucked up by the will of another.

---

1 For a discussion of the Semitic words and Jewish apocalyptic ideas behind κατέχειν , cf. infra, p. 135, also O. Betz, "Der Katechon," NTS 9 (1962-63), pp. 279-82, and Strobel, pp. 101-106.

Morris clearly represents this point of view when he writes, "While it would be easy to think of the Spirit as restraining the forces of evil it is impossible to envisage Him as being "taken out of the way." Such an idea does not appear in Scripture."[1]

The alternative to this interpretation is to understand, ἐκ μέσου γένηται as meaning, "to leave the scene." Ὁ κατέχων is not plucked up by some superior power, but of its own volition, "gets out of the way."

H.W. Fulford after investigating several passages which bear on this phrase, says, "it seems clear that St. Paul contemplates the Restrainer rather as retiring voluntarily from the scene of action than forcibly removed or overthrown."[2]

When we look for parallels to this phrase we look in vain in the N.T., the LXX, or even the Apostolic Fathers. True there are some phrases which are similar, eg. I Cor. 5:2 ἵνα ἀρθῇ ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν . But αἱρεῖν is not γένεσθαι , in spite of the fact that some commentators read the two as equal.[3]

Job 28:2, σίδηρος μὲν γὰρ ἐκ γῆς γίνεται, shows that γένεσθαι can be used to indicate the change of location, and be read here as "taken out", but again ἐκ γῆς is not ἐκ μέσου.

---

1 Morris, pp. 228-29.

2 H. Fulford, "ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται," ET 23 (1910/11), pp. 40-41.

3 J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, (1875), p. 225.

120

However, there are three places where this same phrase appears. In an epistle of pseudo Aeschines 12:5-6 there is the following bit of worldly wisdom. Τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν, ὅτι ἀποθανόντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτω καὶ φεύγοντες ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος, τότε δὴ καὶ μάλιστα, ὁποῖοί τινες ἐγένοντο τοὺς τρόπους, διαδείκνυνται, καὶ γὰρ ἃ συνέκρυπτον αὐτοὶ πρότερον, ἐκ μέσου γενομένων ἀναφαίνεται καθαρῶς . (For who does not know, that when men die or are exiled, then, if ever, they show clearly what kind of a life they had, for whatever they concealed formerly appear in the open, when they are no longer around.)[1]

One could argue here that ἐκ μέσου γενομένωνimplies the removal by force, because the subjects were wither dead or exiled, but the emphasis here is not upon the manner of removal, but the fact that the subject is away, in some permenant fashion. At most this passage only proves that ἐκ μέσου γένεσθαι is neutral as to the <u>means</u> of removal.

A second passage is Achilles Tatius II 27:2, ὅ τε καταμηνύσων οὐκ ἔσται, τῆς Κλειοῦς ἐκ μέσου γενομένης, τάχα δὲ καὶ τὴν κόρην συμφυγεῖν πείσετε. (and when Clio has once disappeared there will be nobody to inform her. And perhaps you will be able to persuade the girl to escape with you.)[2]

In this passage Clinias is seeking to get the young girl

---

1 Ps. Aeschines, <u>Epist</u>. 12.5-6; ed. F. Franke, <u>Teub.</u> (1873), p. 213, translation mine.

2 Achilles Tatius, II 27:2; ed. and tr. S. Gaselee, <u>LCL</u>, (1917), p. 108.

Clio, out of the way. He wants to see her leave privately, but still has to persuade the girl. The phrase ἐκ μέσου γενομένης does not imply anything here as to method of removal. It merely means that Clinias wants Clio away from the present scene. The very fact that Clio has to be persuaded indicates that she is not removed from the scene.

The clearest indication that this phrase does not carry with it the idea of forcible removal is found in a passage in Plutarch, Timoleon 5:3, ἔγνω ζῆν καθ' ἑαυτόν, ἐκ μέσου γενόμενος, καὶ πολιτείαν μὲν ἅπασαν ἀφῆκε, τοὺς δὲ πρώτους χρόνους οὐδὲ κατιὼν εἰς πόλιν. (so that he made up his mind to live by himself, apart from the world. So he gave up all public life, and for a long time did not even return to the city.)[1]

Timoleon having killed his brother, because of his brother's tyranny over Corinth, was rejected by his mother, as well as others. Whereupon Timoleon withdrew from public life. The ἐκ μέσου γενόμενος is by Timoleon's own choice. It does not mean permenant removal, for Timoleon returned to the city later.

Therefore, it seems evident that we must translate ἐκ μέσου γένηται in a neutral fashion, for it only means that ὁ κατέχων is no longer present/active/restraining. This phrase in no way limits the freedom or nature of ὁ κατέχων. Even God himself, could act as ὁ κατέχων, until he ἐκ

---

1 Plutarch, Timoleon, 5:3; ed. and tr. B. Perrin, LCL (1914), VI, 272; cf. also Nicias and Crassus, 2:4.

μέσου γένηται [1].

The Source Problem

In the preceding chapter we noted the presence of traditional material in II Thess. 1 and 2. Specifically we showed that II Thess. 2:3b-4, and 7-12 are unlike the other parts of the epistle, and the fact that these passages come from traditional eschatological teachings which are inserted probably from memory. This source analysis opens up some interesting questions with respect to the variation between the neuter and the masc. use of κατέχειν.

First, the neuter τὸ κατέχον appears in a section which is rewritten to apply to the readers, μνημονεύετε, οἴδατε. The masc. ὁ κατέχων appears in the traditional section, so we can begin with the assumption that the masc. ὁ κατέχων is in the source the author used. However, this does not automatically mean that the neuter is secondary. In II Thess. 2:1-3a we found traces of the source, σαλευθῆναι, θροεῖσθαι, etc., mingled with material adapted to the readers. If the [2] author used this method, there is no guarentee that he did not

---

1 Strobel, p. 106, n.1, wants to see ἐκ μέσου as either a Hebraism, מתוך or a Latinism, e medio tollere. But tollere is not γένεσθαι. O. Betz, p. 281, wants to see the Hebrew verb, תמך behind ἐκ μέσου γένηται. There may well be this influence, and there is no doubt that the apocalyptic texts cited by Betz do relate to this problem in some fashion, but, nevertheless, we are dealing with the precise meaning of a Greek phrase, attested in Greek literature.

2 Cf., supra, p. 84.

123

use the same method in 2:5. We know ὁ κατέχων is from the source. Τὸ κατέχον may or may not be from the source.

The outline of II Thess. 2:1-12 follows in a rough fashion the outline of Matt. 24.[1] In Matt. the disciples ask Jesus about the sign of his coming, παρουσία , and the sign of the end of the age, Matt. 24:3. In answer to this question Jesus warns his disciples not to be led astray, βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ , Matt. 24:4, and he describes the difficulties the apostles (the church) face in their (its) mission. They are to preach the gospel in all the world, 24:14, and then the end will come.

Matt. 24:15 proceeds to tell about the desolating sacrilege and the time of tribulation. This material is directly parallel with our material in II Thess. 2:3b-12. Only after the tribulation does the sign of the Son of Man appear, Matt. 24:30, and then the Son of Man will come on the clouds of heaven.

The sign of the Son of Man is clear, it comes in the heavens with the παρουσία , however, the sign of the end of the age is something else. In Matt. 24:14 we read, καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος . Here there is some question as to whether the sign of the end of the age is the gospel preached in all the world, 24:14, or the appearance of the desolating sacrilege.. In II Thess. 2:1-12 it seems quite clear that the sign for the end of the age is the coming of the Man of Law-

---

1 Hartman, pp. 203-04.

lessness who sets himself up in the temple and makes claim to divinity.

The rough agreement between II Thess. 2:1-12 and Matt. 24 comes when we remember that the traditional words, παρουσία σαλευθῆναι, θροεῖσθαι , and πλανᾶν/ἐξαπατᾶν occur in II Thess. 2:1-3a and in Matt. 24:4ff. In Matt. this section refers to the time <u>before</u> the sign of the end of the age. In II Thess. these words refer to the problems already existing in the Thessalonian church.

The author of II Thess. then goes on to make the point that the Day of the Lord cannot take place until the Man of Lawlessness comes forward. So for II Thess. <u>the period of the church is still in progress</u>, and will continue until the Man of Lawlessness is revealed. Then comes the tribulation and the lawless one will perform signs and wonders by the activity of Satan, II Thess. 2:9. Matt. 24:24 says the same thing about this period of tribulation.

Just as Matt. 24 has the three steps, (1) the warning to the apostles (the church), (2) the tribulation, and (3) the coming of the Son of Man, so II Thess. 2:1-12 has them. The question now arises, can II Thess. 2:5-6 be seen as an editorial comment, inserted into a traditional piece? Certainly it can, for 2:4 leads to 2:7 with the same continuity and just as good, or bad, a grammatical connection.

In this analysis we can see that the masc. ὁ κατέχων takes precedence over the neuter τὸ κατέχον , because II Thess. 2:5 and 6 most likely is an editorial comment.

125

However, this analysis is not final because in Matt. 24:25 Jesus tells his disciples that he has told them about the last things before hand, so that they would not be led astray. Now if II Thess. and Matt. 24 are using a similar traditional source, Matt. 24:25 and II Thess 2:5-6 may both reflect the same point.[1] We have already shown that II Thess. 2:5-6 has a parallel in I Thess. 3:4, but this parallel could be there because of the source and not because of I Thess. As in Matt. 24:25 the source may have called upon the readers to remember that they were told before hand. If this is the case, then both the neuter and the masc. are in the source.

Regardless of this last caution, our source analysis indicates that the masc. ὁ κατέχων is primary, and that τὸ κατέχον may have been added by the author of II Thess.

Now if we are dealing with the same general outline in II Thess. as we have in Matt. 24., then this source analysis can help us further isolate the activity of ὁ κατέχων. Within the argument in II Thess. 2:1-12, ὁ κατέχων prevents the revelation of the Man of Lawlessness and his taking his seat in the temple. If we relate II Thess. and Matt. 24, ὁ κατέχων is the one who stands in the way of the appearance of the sign of the end, i.e. the desolating sacrilege. When ὁ κατέχων stands aside then the end of the age comes, and the Man of Lawlessness appears, followed by the time of tribulation

---

1 Cf., supra, p.57.

126

and finally the coming of the Son of Man/the Day of the Lord.

This appears to be the argument of the source. The author of II Thess. then directs the attention of his readers to the fact that the Day of the Lord could not possibly be here, simply because we are still in stage I, i.e. the Man of Lawlessness, the sign of the end of the age, has not come.

The Background of This Material

To call the background of this material apocalyptic says very little for we need to focus on the specific kind of apocalyptic behind this passage. Dibelius[1] still has the best and most concise statement concerning the mythical background of ὁ κατέχων . By comparing sagas, myths, and tales, he has isolated the apocalyptic schema of pre-time, end-time. Time begins with the chaining of a monster, and at the end-time the monster is loosed. This schema is then applied directly to the problem of ὁ κατέχων . The restraining force, or restrainer, is pictured as the chains which bind the pre-time monster. Dibelius says, "The best Biblical description of the retardation factor is found in Apoc. 20:2,3,7-10, the old serpent, designated as the devil and serpent, is taken, bound, and thrown into the abyss, (for 1000 years). Then he will be loosed and the last struggle begins."[2]

---

1 Dibelius, Comm., pp. 47-50, Neil, Comm., pp. 170ff., leans heavily upon Dibelius and presents the same basic argument in a much simpler form.

2 Dibelius, Comm., p. 49, translation mine.

We do not doubt that the apocalyptic background of this passage is set within this general mythical schema. The various forms of the tale regarding the chaining of the monster do fit the general pre-time, end-time schema of II Thess. However, one is not justified in driving directly to an interpretation of this specific, κατέχων from the very general schema of tales and myths.[1]

II Thess. does not only come out of this general mythical background, but it comes out of the more specific catagory of Jewish apocalyptic, and the apocalyptic development within the early church.

Apocalypticism comes into the early church at one very crucial point. The message of Jesus was not the gospel message of the early church, for the gospel message has to deal with the death and the resurrection. As Vielhauer has said,"In place of the expectations of the reign of God, there now appears the expectation of the Parousia of Christ, and at this point the momentous influx of apocalyptic ideas takes place."[2]

Now the time table of apocalyptic events becomes important first, because Jesus is coming again, and second, at a later stage, because he is not coming as soon as he was expected.

---

1 Betz, p. 279, makes the point that the word δεῖν is used for the binding of the serpent, cf. Apoc. 20:20, Matt. 12:29, and that the concept of binding is a once and for all act, while κατέχειν is a constant activity. Dibelius does go too fast from the "tale" to the "text." There are some steps in between.

2 Vielhauer, p. 609.

In the first instance the apocalyptic time table and the belief in the early return of the Son of Man became the vehicle by which the early church proclaimed the inbreak of God's reign and the salvation wrought in Christ. However, in the second case, the time table became a measuring stick, used to assure the faithful the "he was coming," but the time was not ready. Thus we can see that the influx of apocalypticism into the early church carried with it both a positive and a negative aspect: positive in the sense that it was the vehicle for preaching the inbreak of God's kingdom, Christ's salvation, etc., negative in the sense that the exalted eschatology brought with it the problem of delay and unfullfillment.

This influx of apocalyptic ideas into the early church is not a "helter-skelter" process. The early prophets who spoke apocalyptic words of the risen Lord,[1] spoke words which are an amazing combination of various O.T. and apocalyptic texts. The risen Lord does not just give any kind of utterance, but his Words are confined to the promise-fullfillment pattern of apostolic exegesis.[2] Jesus is the one coming at the end of the age. Jesus is the exalted Son of Man. Jesus

---

1 R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (1963), pp. 108ff., 130ff.

2 Hartman, pp. 235ff. shows how a specific apocalyptic schema from Daniel develops into the apocalyptic teaching of the early church. While we would have grave reservations in assigning the nucleus of this schema to the earthly Jesus, we feel Hartmen's book show the limited way in which apocalypticism develops in the early church, and that it was developed under the control of O.T. apocalyptic texts. Apocalypticism is conservative, and discards nothing.

is the fulfillment of the apocalyptic hope.

The traditions of Jewish apocalyptic not only came into the church for positive (preaching) purposes, but they also came into the church for negative (apologetic) purposes. For example, there is a qualitative difference between the watching and waiting in I Thess. 4 and 5, where Paul expects the return of Jesus in Paul's own life time, and the watching and waiting in Didache 16 where the faithful Christian needs to watch and wait for "the whole time of his faith."

In I Thess, 4 and 5 we can see the beginning of the negative aspect of apocalyptic. Paul had preached the apocalyptic message. Jesus was Lord, and he was coming back soon. Then someone in the community dies, and the church reflects upon the order, the when of the apocalyptic time table, and not upon the fact of the time table. This is the shift from the positive to the negative aspects of apocalyptic. The proclimation that Jesus is the Son of Man who is coming soon to judge the world, was the means by which the community preached the inbreaking of the kingdom. But, just as soon as the concern shifts from the fact that Jesus is coming soon, to a concern over the nearness or distance of the coming itself, a new departure in apocalyptic speculation comes into being.[1]

It is to the point of the order of the time table, and not the fact of the time table that II Thess. is directed.

---

1 H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (1960), pp. 125ff. shows the dramatic way in which this negative aspect of apocalyptic makes an impact upon the Lucan account of the synoptic apocalypse.

130

Here then is the specific apocalyptic background out of which should come the solution of ὁ κατέχων problem. What is it that holds back, or delays the lawless one? The author of II Thess. argues that his readers are mistaken in believing that the Day of the Lord has dawned, because certain events in the time table have not taken place. The specific apocalyptic background we need, is apocalyptic apologetic for the delay of the end.[1]

The problem for apocalyptists is always the problem of enthusiasm. When the end is delayed one has to support flagging zeal. While a movement is strong, appealing, the negative apologetic material makes little headway.

At Qumran for example the community saw itself as part of the end, as the means by which God was ushering in the end.[2] Thus the negative aspect of apocalyptic never played a significant role in the community.[3] However, within the Qumran material many elements appear which fit into the background of II Thess. 2. The general viewpoint of this chapter shares the determinism of Qumran eschatology. "Nothing happens in the world save by the will of God. This is an axiom of faith

---

1 Strobel, pp. 101f.

2 Ringgren, p. 154

3 J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (1958), pp. 115f. shows indirectly how the community solved the problem of the "first 40 years." The community was to be in the wilderness 40 years to prepare the way. However, when 40 years went by they just added on another 40 year period. The delay of the end was no great problem at Qumran.

which is repeated time after time."[1]

To talk about the events or items in the plan of the end-time is to talk about God's plan, or God's decrees. This plan is most clearly expressed in the Community Rule, IQS iv 15ff., where God allots the two spirits until the end, and then comes the judgment.

The phrase τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας , II Thess. 2:7 appears to be related to the רזי פשע , IQ 27.1.2, IQH v 36.[2] A mystery at Qumran is a secret. It is part of God's plan. God has even set a time for the dominion of evil. It is one of God's decisions.[3]

A mystery takes on an eschatological coloring, IQ 27.1, "They know not the mystery to come, nor do they understand the things of the past. They know not that which shall befall them, nor do they save their soul from the mystery to come."[4] To have insight into the mysteries is to know truth. It is esoteric truth, and only for the initiated. So to know a mystery is to know God's plan.[5]

In the Habakkuk commentary there is a connection between the mysteries of God, and the delay of the end. This section, IQp Hab vii.9-14, reads, "If it tarries, wait for it, for it

---

1 Ringgren, p. 50, (IQH i.20, IQS xi.11).

2 Brown, pp. 434ff.

3 Ringgren, pp. 60-62.

4 IQ 27.1; tr. G Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (1962), p. 209.

5 Ringgren, pp. 62-63.

shall surely come and shall not be late. (Hab. 2:3b) Interpreted, this concerns the men of truth who keep the law, whose hands shall not slacken in the service of truth when the final age is prolonged. For all the ages of God reach their appointed end as He determines for them in the mysteries of His wisdom." [1] This is about as close as the Qumran community came to a head-on confrontation with the negative aspect of apocalyptic. Here we can see the emphasis is not upon the problem of delay, but upon the security found in God's plan.

When we turn to an apocalypse like IV Ezra we still have the positive function of apocalyptic working, but the negative aspect is real and intrudes upon the scene. The eagle vision, ch. 11f. is the prime example. As kingdoms come and go the eagle acquires many wings, to explain the occurance of intervening events since the fourth kingdom, "in a vision to your brother Daniel." IV Ezra 12:11f.

Elements found at Qumran are also present in IV Ezra. God's plan is a mystery, IV Exra 10:38. God's mystery is a plan of the ages which He controls and no one else, IV Ezra 6:6f.

II Baruch in a more vivid way reflects these problems. In II Bar. 21 the explicit problem of the negative aspect of apocalyptic is raised, "Command therefore in mercy and accomplish all that Thou saidst Thou wouldst bring, that Thy might may be made known to those who think that Thy long-suffering

---

1 1Qp Hab vii. 9-14; tr. Vermes, p. 237.

133

is weakness."[1] The answer given is the answer of a time table. II Bar. 22:3, "He who travels by a road but does not complete it, or who departs by sea but does not arrive at the port, can he be comforted?"[2] One must be patient. Seeds must grow. A foundation preceeds the roof, II Bar. 22:7-8. The total number of souls has not yet reached the number ordained at creation, II Bar. 23:4f. The author of II Baruch feels the pressure of unfulfillment, but his apocalypticism still has a positive function, for he can still use it as a positive, preaching, vehicle. "Let none thereforeof these present things ascend into your hearts, but above all let us be expectant, because that which is promised to us shall come. And let us not now look unto the delights of the Gentiles in the present, but let us remember what has been promised to us in the end."[3] II Bar. 83:4-5.

In the N.T. the evangelists fit the synoptic apocalypse into their own situations, and this is another method of dealing with the negative side. James 5:7ff. meets the situation head on and argues the time table like II Bar. The farmer has to wait for his fruit; we have to wait for the coming of the Lord. II Peter 3:8 streches the time scale, one day is a thousand years with the Lord, etc. Eph. 2:6-7 over comes the problem by assuring the readers thatthey are already

---

1 II Bar.21:20; tr. R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (1913), II 495.

2 Ibid., p. 495.

3 Ibid., p. 523.

raised up with Christ. Our text wants to refute the belief that the Day of the Lord is dawning, and it does so by reference to the common Christian apocalyptic teaching. However, instead of applying it positively, for preaching purposes, our author uses it negatively, to prove that his readers are mistaken. It is not yet time. The signs are not right. The lawless one has not yet appeared.

The author reminds his readers about the restraining force, and its personal agent. In the source our author used, τὸ κατέχον, and ὁ κατέχων are the plan and the person of God himself. Unless, of course, τὸ κατέχον is from the author himself.

August Strobel has studied the problem of the delay of the parousia by investigating the use and interpretation of Habakkuk 2:3. His study shows the close connection between the texts which speak about the delay or restraint of the parousia, and the various words which relate so closely to κατέχειν.[1] Certainly one must be careful not to say that ὁ κατέχων in II Thess. 2 is just a Greek covering for a Hebrew or Aramaic word. II Thess. is a Greek letter written to Greek speaking people, and κατέχειν must be given its full value as a Greek word. However, a few specific texts will bring together the negative aspect of apocalyptic and a specific content for this word κατέχειν.

The clearest connection is from II Bar. 12:4, "For

---

1 Strobel, pp. 11,13,15,28,30,31,101-107.

135

assuredly in its own season shall the (divine) wrath awake against thee. Which now in long suffering is held in as it were by reins."[1] Fortunately we have both the Syriac and the Greek of this passage.[2] The Greek reads, ἕως ὡς χαλινῶ κατέχεται. The Syriac uses the verb אחד, for κατέχειν. God's wrath is restrained and shall come in its own season. However, the long suffering here is not for any compassion for the wicked, but for compassion for Israel. The delay occurs so that the wicked can fill up their cup of sin and receive even more punishment. This same kind of "compassion" seems to be operating in II Bar. 21:19f., where the events that befell "our holy city" were part of the long suffering of God. Baruch prays for the speedy end of death, sheol, etc., so that the final judgement upon sinners can take place. Here God is the restrainer, ὁ κατέχων, who restrains the judgment and causes all things to come in their season, II Bar. 12:4. This is apocalyptic apologetic working to counteract the negative aspect of apocalyptic hopes. The end is delayed so that sinners can receive the <u>full measure</u> of their punishment. This is used to shore up flagging zeal. The author of II Thess. uses a similar kind of apocalyptic argument not to counter flagging zeal, but overenthusiasm.[3]

---

1 Charles, II 487.

2 <u>P. Oxy.</u>, III. 3-7.

3 It is important to see here, the very different ways the concept of the restrainer is used. Apocalyptic writers can use identical images, but their message can be completely different.

In IV Ezra 4:39, "And it is perhaps on account of us that the time of threshing is delayed for the righteous, on account of the sins of those who dwell on earth,"[1] there is the same question as in II Bar. 12:4 only here the concept is that of delay not restraint. Both are after the same point.

In the Habbakkuk commentary at Qumran, the same argument exists, based on the use of the word אחר in Hab. 2:3b. If it delays, האחרון all seasons come about in their appointed times כאשר חקק לחם, in the mysteries of his prudence, ברזי ערמתן. We can bring into relationship here the word "mystery," i.e. the concept of a divine pre-ordained plan, and an argument relating the concept of delay/restraint with the apocalyptic tradition, with a brand of Judaism which has touched the Christian church at many points.

Conclusions

God himself is ὁ κατέχων and His divine plan is τὸ κατέχον. Whether or not the author of II Thess. understood it this way can be questioned.[3] However it seems clear to me

---

1 IV Ezra 4:39; tr. RSV Apocr.

2 It is interesting to note that a first century prayer inscription from Lydia, Keil-Premer II #224. L.11, directly relates κατέχειν with God, Θεοῦ τοῦ κατέχοντος τὸν κόσμον, In the same inscription the deity is called σαβαθικός and this may indicate Jewish influence. At any rate this inscription does not relate to our text save in pointing out that κατέχειν was a function of deity in Asia Minor at the time of Paul.

3 Vielhauer, p.615 seems to feel that the author intentionally

that the author of II Thess. knew what he was doing, for his apocalyptic elements are carefully fitted into his overall plan.

However, there is a good possibility that the author of II Thess. fitted the phrase, οὐ μνημονεύετε . . . τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε , I Thess 2:5, into the apocalyptic source in order to personalize the message. If this phrase is removed, the phrases and images piled up to modify the Man of Lawlessness, II Thess. 2:3 come to a better conclusion in II Thess. 2:6b, . . . ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶν θεός, (remove 2:5-6a) εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ . Now there is no trouble seeing ὁ κατέχων as the one who holds back/delays/restrains the lawless one, so that he will come in his own time.

As noted on p.121the phrase ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται does not have anything to do with "being forcibly removed." It simply means to stand aside, "The one (God) who holds back (the Man of Lawlessness) will do so (to complete the anacoluthon) until he (God) stands aside, and then the Man of Lawlessness will be revealed."

This problem of ὁ κατέχων helps us focus upon the explicit purpose of this epistle. The author is writing to people who honor the apocalyptic tradition as authoritative. The author writes to people who are having trouble with their apocalypticism because it has disrupted their normal lives,

---

(n. 3, p.136 cont.) obscured the issue, either because he did not know what ὁ κατέχων was, or to mystify his readers.

138

and normal church life.[1]

They thought the end was dawning. They did not need to work, for the Son of Man, the Lord Jesus would come very shortly. The author then writes a letter using an apocalyptic argument to "cool off" an apocalyptic fervor. The time is not yet. The Man of Lawlessness has not appeared. He is still being restrained by God himself. Do your own work. Live in quietness. God is working out his plan.

---

1 One of the telling arguments for me, against the traditional view that II Thess. comes immediately after I Thess. to set straight the false hopes for a speedy return of Christ is that I Thess. does not say anything which would raise apocalyptic hopes so high that people would leave off their normal lives and stop working. Especially since Paul tells them in I Thess. 4:10b-11a, παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, περισσεύειν μᾶλλον, καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν, καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν,

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions with regard to structure and purpose which have been indicated thus far are not new, nor original with this study. The observations that II Thess. is intimately related to I Thess. and to developing Christian apocalyptic, and that II Thess. is written to counter apocalyptic fervor, are the standard conclusions of Thessalonian research.

However, the purpose here has been to refine the arguments and point with precision to the structure and purpose of the epistle, so that it may be investigated without first taking a position on the authorship question. Certainly the authorship question cannot be ignored, and at the end of this chapter we will set out the conditions imposed by this study upon it.

Besides the major conclusions as to structure and purpose, there are also some secondary themes which were dealt with, e.g. the relationship of II Thess. to early Christian Apocalyptic, the meanings of certain words and phrases, etc. Conclusions regarding these questions are presented with the major themes, where these secondary issues fit into the argument.

Conclusions with Regard to Structure

The epistolary outline of II Thess. is built upon the structure found in I Thess. The letters have identical

140

salutations. Both letters use multiple thanksgiving formulas. Both letters present their contents in the same two part form. Both letters close each content section with a benediction. These individual points, while part of the general Pauline letter form, are unique in that they occur in each of these two letters. No other Pauline letters have these close agreements in epistolary outline.

However, in II Thess. there are three points where the epistolary structure departs from the normal Pauline letter style. In the salutation the phrase, "God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," is repeated in both cola, and this is never done in the other Pauline letters. The multiple thanksgiving prayer forms in II Thess. do not fit the context as they do in I Thess. Here is the application of a form, but without the content necessary to integrate it into the letter. II Thess. includes eschatological instruction in the first part of the letter, and this is never done in the other Pauline letters.

Both the similarities and the departures from normal Pauline letter style warrant the conclusion that II Thess. is an imitation of I Thess., but the imitation is somewhat mechanical and does not reveal a complete understanding of the Pauline style.

That II Thess. is modeled after I Thess. becomes even more clear when we consider the literary parallels between the epistles. There are words, phrases, and combinations of words which can only be explained on the basis of a conscious use of the text in I Thess. by the author of II Thess. This

is a cumulative argument in that many of the allusions of II Thess. to I Thess. could exist by chance, but not the great number of them. These word and phrase parallels between the two epistles appear most often when the author is dealing with the form of the letter and not the content of the letter. Prayers, benedictions, thanksgivings, and transitions account for the greater part of these parallels.

However, these verbal agreements stop altogether or change in kind in certain portions of the letter. These sections are II Thess. 1:6-10, 2:1-12. These are also the sections which seem to depart most radically from the normal Pauline epistolary outline. These particular sections are related in an intimate fashion with Matt. 24 and Didache 16. The use of specific words, images, and allusions to the apocalypse of Daniel show that II Thess. 1:6-10 and 2:1-12 are parts of a fairly well defined early Christian teaching on the last things. This is not to say that there was a common source, written or memorized, which they all followed, but it is to say that there was a common tradition in terms of certain words, images, and apocalyptic setting which informed all these writings.

Beginning with I Thess. 4:13ff. and touching Mark 13, Matt. 24, Luke 21, II Thess., Didache16, and finally the Apoc. of John, especially ch. 13, we have seen a development of this early Christian tradition and teaching. While it retains all of the older images and allusions, the various authors use it, rather freely, to make new points, and meet new situations.

The two sections, II Thess. 1:6-10 and 2:1-12 are related to each other because they both are reflections of the same

tradition. They both reflect the background of Daniel. They both reflect a similar style which is different from the remainder of the epistle.

The author of II Thess. used two sources for the structure of his epistle. From I Thess. he took the epistolary outline, which he fitted around selections of this early Christian apocalyptic tradition. We need to be careful here not to see the author, sitting at a desk, clipping and fitting. Rather we have to see him reproducing material from I Thess. which is fresh in his mind, and this early Christian tradition which he has used time and time again, in teaching and preaching. The author is using these sources with creativity, and with a definite purpose in mind.

Conclusions with Regard to Purpose

The focus of the epistle comes in the second chapter. The author sets out to counter the idea that the Day of the Lord is dawning. The situation pictured in the epistle is that of an agitated community. Some, at least, have set aside the normal routines of life, for they were convinced that they were already caught up in the events of the end time. The Day of the Lord was dawning, and Jesus would soon be here. It was inevitable. It is against this belief that the epistle is directed. Not everyone in the church is pictured as being so aroused, and there is no hint as to the cause of this disruption.

The pivot point for determining the purpose of the epistle is the exact meaning of the word, ἐνέστηκεν . The precise

143

meaning in II Thess. 2:2 lies between our word imminent and the concept of being present. It does not mean that the Day will come soon, or that the fulness of the Day is already here. Probably the best translation is, "The Day of the Lord is dawning."

Now to counter this idea, the author goes to the early Christian teaching on the last things. From it he shows that the Day of the Lord could not possibly be dawning, for the items which were to preceed it have not yet come forward. Specifically, the Man of Lawlessness has not come upon the scene.

The purpose of the author is to cool off apocalyptic enthusiasm and return the community to more normal activities. He argues on the basis of apocalypticism to apocalyptists that their enthusiasm is misdirected, because certain necessary elements in the end time process have not yet taken place.

In II Thess. the Man of Lawlessness functions in a similar manner to the Abomination of Desolation in Matt. 24, and the Cosmic Deceiver in Didache 16. In all three places, this end time symbol of deception and evil is the necessary prelude to the coming of the Son of Man/Lord Jesus.

Our author not only challenges his readers to recognize that the Man of Lawlessness has not yet appeared, but he goes on to indicate why. This harbinger of cosmic evil is being restrained by God himself, ὁ κατέχων , on the basis of God's immutable decree, τὸ κατέχον . It is one of God's mysteries, ר ז, in the predestined course of this world.

From this apocalyptic proof the author appeals to his readers to go back to work, to live quietly, for God's plan is working

itself out with inexorable precision.

The fascinating thing about this apocalyptic material is the way the author uses it in reverse. Normally, apocalyptic imagery and argument is used to urge on the faithful to greater deeds of faithfulness, resistance, belief, etc. Yet here the same images and arguments are used to play down enthusiasm. Instead of attempting to give the reader hope, the purpose of II Thess. is to curb an apocalyptic hope which has assured itself of present realization.

Again it would be wrong to look for a specific historical event which could have produced this situation in the church, and then attempt to date II Thess. by it. This process simply gives every emperor and calamity its day. We can determine the purpose of II Thess. precisely, but we cannot do the same for its date of composition and its author.

The Authorship Question

To raise the authorship question does not mean to solve it. In this study certain conclusions have been reached which do affect the question of authorship. Certain questions have been rasied which must be taken into account by any hypothesis.

The first is the question of epistolary outline. Since II Thess. is modeled on I Thess., and since no other two Pauline epistles are so related, how can we account for this? If Paul is the author then we have to see him using I Thess. or a copy of I Thess. as a model. Further we have to consider the departure from the normal Pauline letter form in II Thess., and how much weight to give these various items.

145

Are the departures sufficient to deny the epistle to Paul, or are they discrepencies one can tolerate within the style of an author?

The verbal resemblances and parallels between the two epistles strengthen the primary conclusion that II Thess. is modeled on I Thess. These parallels tend to speak against the Pauline authorship because they support the departures from the normal Pauline letter style. The support comes about in this fashion. Words in II Thess. are used in a non-Pauline fashion, while at the same time, the same words are used in another way in I Thess. (see p. 53). In the salutation, a Pauline form is used in a non-Pauline manner, even where it is almost verbally parallel with I Thess. (see p.49). In like manner the multiple use of thanksgiving prayers in II Thess. show a stilted relationship to I Thess. Both epistles have multiple forms and this in itself is unique, but while I Thess. has these forms carefully integrated into the content of the epistle, II Thess. uses them in a much more cumbersome, and mechanical way.

The time element in the relationship between I Thess, and and II Thess. is also crucial for the authorship question. If Paul is the author, then how much time elapsed between the two epistles? There is no question that there is a great difference in tone and warmth between the two epistles. Why should Paul be so personal in one letter and not in the other? To reconcile the mood difference, as well as the parallel in outline and composition, and still have Pauline authorship, we would have to postulate a time interval between the letters, and the presence of I Thess. as a model.

If II Thess. is deutero-Pauline then this time element and difference in tone poses no problem.

The structure of II Thess. also imposes certain strictures upon the authorship problem. In our analysis of II Thess. we have mentioned three elements: (1) a Pauline letter outline, (2) material from the early Christian teaching on the last things, and (3) the argument of the author. There is no compelling reason to attribute any of these three elements to Paul, and Paul alone.

The Pauline nature of the epistolary outline is at best ambiguous. In fact, it is easier to see it as an attempt to be Pauline, rather than as a compelling Pauline presentation. The material related to the early Christian teaching is presented as traditional material, and the word usage, sentence structure, and argument in it, would certainly not be Pauline. Even if one holds to the Pauline authorship he has to conclude that here, Paul was reproducing a source. In the argument of the author himself, the evidence is again ambiguous at best. The author's argument that the Day of the Lord is not dawning, because the Man of Lawlessness has not appeared, is no clear cut Pauline argument. Nowhere else is this Man of Lawlessness mentioned in Paul. Rather I Cor. 15 and I Thess. 4 and 5 emphasize the reality and the proximity of the Day of the Lord. In fact it would be just as easy to see II Thess. as a product of the theological thinking behind Luke-Acts, as it would be to attribute it to Paul. II Thess. places eschatology in the future and dwells upon the living of life in the present time of the church.

147

Therefore, with regard to structure, Pauline authorship is not critical, neither for the epistolary outline, (Paul himself would have to have a copy of the letter before him), nor for the apocalyptic material, (it is traditional), nor for the specific argument, (it is unique at best, with regard to Pauline theology).

The purpose of the letter is clear. It is to cool off eschatological enthusiasm. For the authorship question, this relates directly to I Thess. The traditional position is that II Thess is sent to squelch the enthusiasm generated by I Thess. This is doubtful at best, (see p.138). To maintain Pauline authorship one would have to move away from this particular time relationship simply because of the verbal and epistolary parallels. II Thess. could not be written before I Thess. (see p. 46).

To maintain the traditional authorship one would have to construct a situation similar to the following. Paul wrote I Thess. His scribe kept his notes, or a complete copy of the letter. At some later date Paul hears of disturbances in Thessalonica. He reads over the previous letter and dictates a new one. Paul is either upset in his own person, or strained relations exist between Paul and the Thessalonians. He writes a cold, rather formal note. In the time between I Thess. and II Thess. Paul loses some of his assurance that he would live to see the Day of the Lord. In II Thess. there is no mention of the proximity of the end, and if Paul had I Thess. before him, it can only be assumed that he moved away from the position that, "we . . who are left . . . shall not proceed those who have fallen

148

asleep." Paul either wrote II Thess. without precision, or his usage of the terms faith and boasting changed, (see p. 53). However, even if Paul were the author, he has left us nothing in this epistle which is distinctively Pauline.

The great objection to this hypothesis is that Paul would have to follow his first epistle with slavish precision at some points, and careless abandon at other points. The hypothesis of a secretary may help. Here Paul could be the author, but the secretary the writer. Paul tells the secretary to go to the file and look up Thessalonica. The secretary brings a copy of I Thess. Paul looks it over and gives general instructions. "Write a letter telling them that . . ." The secretary prepares the letter taking the pattern of I Thess., the traditional teaching on eschatology, and a specific argument given by Paul. Paul signs and the letter is sent. This is the nice kind of compromise where we kill the cow for meat, and still get milk every morning. All that is Pauline is attributed to Paul. All that is non-Pauline is attributed to the secretary, and Paul's authority covers the whole.

This alternative like the former depends upon the portable filing cabinet, and a Paul who directed his mission work much like the executives of mission boards today. Certainly Paul could be sick, or in jail, etc., and have a fellow worker write the letter, but it is so easy to shore up a hypothesis with speculation.

The third alternative for authorship is that this letter is written after the death of Paul, in his name/authority to

correct a situation in the church or churches where such a letter would have influence. It could have been written from Thessalonica, for here the author would have access to the first letter, unless of course, the letter was already circulating. This alternative does not require that II Thess. be written to or for Thessalonica itself. The apocalyptic disturbances do not have to be located in that particular church. Using this hypothesis, II Thess. can be seen as a letter written in the final third of the first century by a successor of Paul for the purpose of correcting the problem of apocalyptic enthusiasm which was disturbing some part of the old Pauline mission field.

While this third alternative seems to fit the facts best, the other two cannot be summarily dismissed. However, it would seem plain that even if one accepted the Pauline authorship, he would not be justified in using the epistle as a normative source for Pauline theology or style. There are just too many problems present for this letter to be delivered safely into the fold of Paul's life and letters.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers, ed. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson. New York 1893.
BGU	Berliner griechische Urkunden. Berlin 1895-.
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Comm.	Commentary on Thessalonians
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindodonensis
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
ET	Expository Times
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, herausg. v. d. Kirchenväter-Commission d. preuss. Acad. d. Wissensch.
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
JBL	The Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
MG	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, ed. J. P. Migne: Series Patrum Graecorum. Paris 1857-1866.
NPNF	The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. Philip Schaff. Buffalo 1886.
NTS	New Testament Studies
OGIS	Orientes Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger. Leipzig 1903-5.
P. Cairo Zen.	Zenon Papyri I-IV, ed. C. C. Edgar. Paris 1925-31.
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
P. Fay.	Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and D. G. Hogarth. London 1900.
P. Giess.	Griechische Papyri zu Giessen I, ed. E. Kornemann, O. Eger, and P. M. Meyer. Leipzig etc. 1910-12.

P. Grenf.	Greek Papyri, sr. i and ii, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. (sr. i is An Alexandrian erotic fragment and other Greek Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic, ed. B. P. Grenfell. Oxford 1896; sr. ii is New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. Oxford 1897.)
P. Oxy.	The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, I-XVII, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. London 1898-.
PSI	Papiri della Società Italiana, (Papiri greci e latini. Firenze 1912-.)
Rev. ég.	Revue égyptologique
RHPR	Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RSV Apocr.	The Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version
SAH	Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg
Teub.	Bibliotheca . . . Teubneriana
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel; tr. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, tr. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids 1964-.
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts and Translations

Biblia hebraica . . ., ed. R. Kittel. 12th ed. by P. Kahle, A. Alt, O. Eissfeldt. Stuttgart 1961.

Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum:
IX: 1. Maccabaeorum liber 1, ed. W. Kappler. Göttingen 1936.
X. Psalmi cum Odis, ed. A. Rahlfs. Göttingen 1931.
XIII. Duodecim prophetae, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen 1943.
XIV. Isaias, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen 1939.
XV. Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen 1954.
XVI: 1. Ezechiel, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen 1954.
XVI: 2. Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco, ed. J. Ziegler. Göttingen 1954.

Septuaginta . . . I-II, ed. A. Rahlfs. 7th ed. Stuttgart 1962.

Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . I-II, ed. F. Field. Oxford 1875.

Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. E. Nestle, K. Aland. 25th ed. Stuttgart 1963.

The Greek New Testament, ed. K. Aland, M. Black, B. Metzger, A. Wikgren. Stuttgart 1966.

Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. . ., ed. K. Aland. Stuttgart 1964.

The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York 1952.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English I-II, ed. R. H. Charles. Oxford 1913.

Die Esra-Apokalypse I-II, ed. B. Violet. (GCS) Leipzig 1910-24.

The Ezra-Apocalypse . . ., ed. G. H. Box. London 1912.

The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch, ed. R. H. Charles. (Analects Oxon. Sem. Ser. II.) Oxford 1906.

The Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version. New York 1957.

Discoveries in the Judean Desert II. Les Grottes de Murabba'at, ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, R. deVaux. Oxford 1961.

Die Texte aus Qumran, hebräisch und Deutsch . . ., ed. E. Lohse. München 1964.

The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, tr. G. Vermes. London 1962.

The Apostolic Fathers . . ., I-II, ed. K. Lake. (LCL) Cambridge, Mass. 1950-52.

Die apostolischen Väter. Neubearb. d. Funkschen Ausgabe I, ed. K. Bihlmeyer, W. Schneemelcher. (Samml. ausgew. kirchen- u. dogmengesch. Quellenschr. II:1:1.) 2nd ed. Tübingen 1956.

Kuhn, K. Das Muratorische Fragment über die Bücher des Neuen Testaments. Zürich 1892.

Das muratorische Fragment und die monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien. (Kleine Texte für theologische Vorlesungen und Uebungen. 7) Bohn 1902.

Theron, D. Evidence of Tradition. London 1957.

Tertullian, de Ress., ed. A. Kroymann. (CSEL 47, p. 25-125) Wien 1906.

Chrysostom, Hom. IV in II Thess. 2:6-9, (MG 62, p. 415-22) Paris 1862.

Augustine, De Civ. Dei XX, ed. E. Hoffmann. (CSEL 40, part II, p. 471-75) Leipzig 1900.

_____. De Civ. Dei XX, ed. W. Greene. (LCL vol. VI) Cambridge, Mass. 1960.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers, ed. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson. New York 1893.

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. P. Schaff. Buffalo 1886.

An Alexandrian erotic fragment and other Greek Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic, ed. B. P. Grenfell. Oxford 1896.

Aramaic Documents of the 5th Cent. B.C., ed. G. R. Driver. Oxford 1954.

Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Cent. B.C., ed. A. Cowley. Oxford 1923.

Bell, H. I. "Some Private Letters of the Roman Period, from the London Collection," Rev. ég. new series 1/2 (1919-24) 199-209.

Berliner griechische Urkunden. (Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin) Berlin 1895-.

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, D. G. Hogarth. London 1900.

Griechische Papyri im Museum des oberhessischen Geschichts vereins zu Giessen I, 1-3, ed. O. Eger, E. Kornemann, P. M. Meyer. Leipzig, etc. 1910-12.

Keil, J. and von Premerstein, A. Bericht über eine 2. Reise in Lydien, ausgeführt 1908 im Auftrag der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Denkschriften der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil. - hist. Klasse, Bd. 54, 2) Vienna 1911.

New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt. Oxford 1897.

Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger. Leipzig 1903-5.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt. London 1898-.

Papiri greci e latini. (Pubblicazioni della Societa italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto) Firenze 1912-.

Selected Papyri, ed. A. S. Hunt, C. C. Edgar. (LCL vol. I) London, Cambridge, Mass. 1932.

Welles, C. Bradford, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. New Haven 1934.

Zenon Papyri I-IV, ed. C. C. Edgar. (Catal. gén. des Antiq. égypt. du Musée du Caire 79) Paris 1925-31.

Achilles Tatius, in Erotici Scriptores Graeci, ed. R. Hercher. (Teub.) Leipzig 1858-9.

_____. ed. S. Gaselee. (LCL) London, 1917.

Ps. Aeschines, Epist., ed. F. Blass. (Teub.) Leipzig 1896.

Epistolographi Graeci, ed. R. Hercher. Leipzig 1873.

Flavii Josephi opera omina I-IV, ed. S. A. Naber. (Teub.) Leipzig 1888-96.

Josephus, Ant. XVII. 169, ed. R. Marcus, A. Wikgren. (LCL vol. VIII) London, Cambridge, Mass. 1963.

Plutarchus, Vitae Parallelae, ed. C. Sintenis. (Teub.) Leipzig 1881-95; ed. C. Lindskog, K. Ziegler. (Teub.) Leipzig 1914-1915.

_____. Lives . . ., ed. B. Perrin. (LCL vol. I-X) London, Cambridge, Mass. 1914.

B. Literature

Audet, J. P. La Didachè. Instructions des Apôtres. (Études Bibliques) Paris 1958.

Bahr, G. J. "Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century," CBQ 28 (1966) 465-77.

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, tr. and revised by W. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago 1957.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. Jesus and the Future. London 1954.

Betz, O. "Der Katechon," NTS 9 (1962/3) 276-291.

Birnbaum, S. A. "The Beth Mashku Document," PEQ (1955) 21-33.

_____. "Bar Kokhba and Akiba," PEQ (1954) 23-31.

Blass, F., DeBrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, tr. and revised by R. W. Funk. Chicago 1961.

Bornemann, F. W. B. Die Thessalonicherbriefe. (Meyer series) Göttingen 1894.

Bornkamm, G. "Die Vorgeschichte des sog. Zweiten Korintherbriefs," SHA (1961) 2-38.

Bousset, W. The Antichrist Legend, tr. A. H. Keane. London 1896.

Bright, John. Jeremiah. (The Anchor Bible) Garden City, New York 1965.

Brown, J. P. "Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form History," NTS 10 (1963/4) 27-48.

Brown, R. "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion," Biblica 39 (1958) 426-448.

Bruce, F. F. "Christianity under Claudius," BJRL 44 (1961/2) 309-326.

Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, tr. J. Marsh. New York 1963.

Burkitt, F. C. Christian Beginnings. London 1924.

Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St. Luke, tr. G. Buswell. New York 1960.

Cullmann, O. "Le caractére eschatologique du devoir et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul. Étude sur le κατέχον (ων) de II Thess. 2:6-7," RHP 16 (1936) 210-245.

Deissmann, A. Light from the Ancient East, tr. L. R. M. Strachan New York 1910.

Delling, G. Worship in the New Testament, tr. P. Scott. Philadelphia 1962.

Dibelius, M. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. (The International Library of Christian Knowledge) New York 1963.

_____. An die Thess. I/II. An die Phil. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament XI, 3. Auf.) Tübingen 1937.

Exler, F. X. J. The Form of the Ancient Letter. A Study of Greek Epistolography. Washington 1923.

Frame, J. E. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. (The International Critical Commentary) Edinburgh 1912.

Friedrich, G. "Lohmeyers These über das paulinische Briefprä-skript kritisch beleuchtet," TLZ 5/6 (1956) 245-6.

Fulford, H. W. "ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται ." (II Thess. 2:7)," ET 23 1910/11) 40-41.

Goguel, Maurice. Intro. au Nouveau Testament. (4 parts in 5 vols.) Paris 1922-26.

Graafen, J. Die Echtheit des zweiten Briefes an die Thessalonicher. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen Bd. XIV, H. 5) München 1930.

Gunkel, H. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Göttingen 1895.

Hanse, H. "Κατέχειν ," TWNT ad. loc.

Harnack, A. "Das Problem des Zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs," Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akademie der Wiss., Phil. hist. Kl. (1910) 560-78.

Harrison, P. N. Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians. Cambridge 1936.

Hartman, L. Prophecy Interpreted, tr. N. Tomkinson. (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 1) Uppsala 1966.

Kern, F. H. "Ueber II Thess. 2:1-12," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 2 (1839) 145-214.

Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul. London 1946.

Knox, J. "A Conjecture as to the Original Status of II Cor. and II Thess. in the Pauline Corpus," JBL 55 (1936) 145-153.

_____. Marcion and the New Testament. Chicago 1942.

Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge 1935.

Köster, H. "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Phil. III)," NTS 8 (1961/2) 317-332.

Lake, K. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. London 1911.

Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. London 1875.

Lohmeyer, E. "Probleme paulinischen Theologie. I Briefliche Grussüberschriften," ZNW 26 (1927) 158-9.

Manson, T. W. "St. Paul in Greece," BJRL 35 (1952/3) 428-447.

Masson, C. Les Deux Épitres aux Thessaloniciens. (Commentaire du Noveau Testament XIa) Paris 1957.

Michaelis, W. "Kontroverse: Der zweite Thess. kein Phil.," ThZ 1 (1945) 282-286.

Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, tr. J. Strugnell. (Studies in Biblical Theology) Naperville, Ill. 1959.

Milligan, G. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. London 1908.

Morris, L. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. (The New London Commentary on the New Testament) London 1959.

Munck, J. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, tr. F. Clarke. Richmond 1959.

Neil, W. The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians. (Moffatt Series) New York 1948.

Oepke, A. "ἐνίστημι," TWNT ad. loc.

Orchard, J. B. "Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels," Biblica 19 (1938) 19-42.

Peradse, G. "Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel in der georgischen Ueberlieferung," ZNW 31 (1932) 111-116.

Prat, F. Théologie du saint Paul I-II, (28th ed.) Paris 1938-41.

Rigaux, B. Saint Paul, Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens, (Etudes Bibliques) Paris 1956.

Ringgren, H. The Faith of Qumran, tr. E. T. Sander. Philadelphia 1963.

Robinson, J. M. "Die Hodajot Formel in Gebet und Hymnus," in Apophoreta, (Festschrift für E. Hänchen) ed. W. Eltester, F. H. Kettler. Berlin 1964.

Roller, O. Das Formular der paulinische Briefe. (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 58) Stuttgart 1933.

Sander, E. ΠΥΡΩΣΙΣ, (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Harvard Divinity School) Cambridge, Mass. 1967.

Sanders, J. T. "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus," JBL 81 (1962) 340-62.

Schäfer, A. Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Thessalonicher und des Briefes an die Galater. (Die Bücher des Neuen Testaments I) München 1890.

Schmidt, J. E. C. "Vermutungen über die beiden Briefe an die Thess.," Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese der Neues Test. 2 (1801) 380-386.

Schubert, P. Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 20) Berlin 1939.

Schweizer, E. "Der II Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief?," TLZ 1 (1945) 90-105.

_____. "Replik," TLZ 1 (1945) 286-289.

Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology, tr. J. Marsh. London 1955.

Strobel, A. Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem. (Supplements to Novum Testamentum II) Leiden 1961.

Vielhauer, P. "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity," in New Testament Apocrybha II, ed. E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher, tr. R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia 1965, pp. 608-642.

Wegenast, K. Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen. (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 8) Neukirche 1962.

Weiss, J. The History of Primitive Christianity, tr. F. C. Grant. New York 1936.

Weizsäcker, C. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, tr. J. Millar (Theological Translating Library I, V, tr. of 2nd ed., 3rd ed. in 1902) London 1894-5.

Wendland, P. Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 2. u. 3. Auf., Bd. I, 2. u. 3. T.) Tübingen 1912.

West, J. C. "The Order of I and II Thess.," JTS 15 (1913/14) 66-74.

Wikenhauser, A. New Testament Introduction, tr. J. Cunningham. New York 1963.

Wrede, W. Die Echtheit der Zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs. (Texte und Untersuchen n. f. Bd. IX T. II) Leipzig 1903.

Yadin, Y. "Expedition D," IEJ 11 (1960) 36-52.

C. A selected Bibliography on Thessalonians since 1956

(for material prior to 1956 see B. Rigaux, Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens, (Études Bibliques) Paris 1956.)

Andriessen, P. "Celui qui reteint la venue du Seigneur," Bijdragen 21 (1960) 20-30.

Bailey, J. W. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. (The Interpreter's Bible XII 245-339) New York, Nashville 1955.

Baltensweiler, H. "Erwägungen zu I Thess. 4:3-8," Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel 19 (1963) 1-13.

Bammel, E. "Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen staatsanschauung," TLZ 85 (1960) 835-46.

_____. "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 56 (1959) 294-315.

Beare, F. W. "The First Letter of St. Paul to the Thess.," Canadian Journal of Theology 8 (1962) 4-10.

Beauvey, R. "πλεοεκτεῖν in I Thess 4:6a," Verbum Domini 33 (1955) 78-85.

Boor, W. Die Briefe des Paulus and die Thess. Wuppertal 1960.

Braun, H. "Zur nachpaulinischen Herkunft des Zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs," in Braun, H. Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Tübingen 1962, pp. 205-209.

Brunec, M. "De Homine Peccati in II Thess. 2:1-12," Verbum Domini 35 (1957) 3-33.

Campbell, T. H. "Paul's Missionary Journies as reflected in his Letters," JBL 74 (1955) 80-87.

Cullmann, O. "Andacht zur Eröffnung der S.N.T.S. am 30. August 1965 in Heidelberg," (I Thess. 5:19-21) NTS 12 (1966) 140-44.

Day, Peter, "The Practical Purpose of II Thess.," Anglical Theological Review 45 (1963) 203-26.

Delorme, J. "Sur . . . I Thess. 4:13-17," L'Ami du Clergé 65 (1955) 247-51.

Denis, A. M. "L'Apôtre Paul, prophète 'messianique' des Gentils. Étude thématique de I Thess. 11:1-6," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 33/2 (1957) 245-318.

Dewailly, L. M. "Une Communanté Naissante: Thess.," La Vie Spirituelle 104 (1961) 359-76; 105 (1961) 254-69.

_____. "Course et glorie de la Parole (II Thess. 3:1)," Revue Biblique 71 (1964) 25-41.

_____. "Saint Paul et la Jeune Eglise de Thessalonique," Lectio Divina 37 (1963) 7-158.

Duncan, G. S. "Chronological Table to Illustrate Paul's Ministry in Asia," New Testament Studies 5 (1958/9) 43-5.

Eckart, K. G. "Der zweite echte Brief der Apostles Paulus an die Thessalonicher," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 58 (1961) 30-44.

Faw, C. E. "On the writing of Ist Thess." JBL 71 (1952) 217-225.

Fransen, I. "Le jour du Seigneur, I et II Thess." Bible et Vie Chretienne 8 (1954/55) 76-88.

Friedrich, G. "Ein Tauflied hellenistischer Judenchristen, I Thess. 1:9f.," ThZ 21 (1965) 502-16.

Giblin, C. H. The Threat to Faith - an Exegetical and Theological Re-Evaluation of II Thess. 2. (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Pontifical Biblical Institute) Rome 1966.

Gregson, R. "A Solution to the Problems of the Thessalonian Epistles," Evangelische Theologie 38 (1966) 76-80.

Green, E. M. B. "A Note on I Thess. 4:15-17," Expository Times 69/9 (1958) 285-286.

Hamann, H. "Brief Exegesis of II Thess. 2:1-12 with guidance for the application of prophecy contained therein," Concordia Theol. Monthly 24 (1953) 418-433.

Harrison, W. K. "The time of Rapture as Indicated in certain Scriptures," Bibliotheca Sacra 114 (1957) 316-25; 115 (1958) 20-36.

Huber, P. Der Zweite Thessalonicher-Brief ausgelegt für die Gemeinde. Basel 1958.

Kalweit, P. and Puttkammer, G. Der Philipperbrief und die Thessalonicherbriefe. Kassel 1958.

Katz, P. "'Εν πυρὶ φλογός ," II Thess. 1:8," ZNW 46 (1955) 33-38.

Kümmel, W. G. "Das literarische und geschichtliche Problem der ersten Thess.," Neotestamentica et Patristica, ed. W. C. van Unnik et al. (Supplements to Novum Testamentum VI 213-27) Leiden 1962.

Langevin, P.-É. "Le Seigneur Jésus selon un texte prépaulinien, I Thess. 1:9-10," Sciences Ecclésiastiques 17 (1965) 473-512.

Lineberry, J. Vital Word Studies in I Thess. Grand Rapids 1960.

Lövestam, E. Spiritual Wakefulness in the New Testament. (Lund Univ. Arsskrift I, 55, 3) Lund 1963.

Masson, C. Les Deux Épîtres aux Thessaloniciens. (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament XIa) Paris 1957.

Miguens, M. "L'Apocalisse 'secondo Paolo' II Thess. 2:3-12," Bibbia e Oriente 2 (1960) 142-48.

Morris, L. The epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians. (The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries) London 1956.

_____. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. (The New London Commentary on the New Testament) London 1959.

_____. "καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς , Phil. 4:16, I Thess. 2:18," Novum Testamentum 1 (1959) 205-08.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Influence of Circumstances on the use of Eschatological Terms," The Journal of Theological Studies 15 (1964) 1-15.

Munck, J. "I Thess. 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul. Textual Exegesis and Hermenutical Reflections." New Testament Studies 9 (1962/3) 91-110.

Munck, J. "Paulus tanquam abortivus," in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, ed. M. Black. Manchester 1962.

Nepper-Christensen, P. "Das verborgene Herrnwort. Eine Untersuchung über I Thess. 4:13-18," Studia Theologica 19 (1965) 136-54.

Oepke, A. Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher. (Das Neue Testament Deutsch Bd. VIII s. 155-85, 9. Auf.) Göttingen 1962.

Otzen, P. "Gute Hoffnung bei Paulus," ZNW 49 (1958) 283-5.

Pfendsack, W. Junge Gemeinde: Eine Auslegung des I Thess. Basel 1961.

Precedo, L. J. "I Thess. 5:8, Eph. 6:14-17," in Studia Paulina Congressus. (1961, II 343-59) Rome 1963.

Rigaux, B. Saint Paul et ses Lettres: Etat de la Question. (Studia Neotestamentica Subsidia II) Paris 1962.

_____. Thessaloniciens. (Bible de Jerusalem 2nd ed.) Paris 1960.

_____. "Vocabulaire Chretien anterieux a la premier epitre aux Thess.," Sacra Pagina 2 (1959) 380-9.

Rissi, M. Die Taufe für die Toten. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Tauflehre. (Abhandlungen zu Theologie der Alten and Neuen Testaments 42) Zürich, Stuttgart 1962.

Robinson, D. W. B. "II Thess. 2:6, 'That which restrains,' or 'That which holds sway,'" in Studia Evangelica II, ed. F. L. Cross. Berlin 1964, pp. 635-8.

Rossano, P. "A che punto siamo con I Thess. 4:13-17," Revista Biblica 4 (1956) 72-80.

_____. "Note archeologiche sull' antica Thess.," Revista Biblica 6 (1958) 242-47.

Schippers, R. "The pre-synoptic tradition in I Thess. 2:13-16," Novum Testamentum 8 (1966) 223-24.

Schlier, H. "Auslegung des I Thess. 1:1-10, 2:1-16," Bibel und Leben 3 (1962) 16-25, 89-97, 174-84, 240-49; 4 (1963) 19-30.

Schmithals, W. "Die Thessalonicherbriefe als Briefkomposition," in Zeit und Geschichte, ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen 1964.

_____. "Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe," ZNW 51 (1960) 225-45.

Schneider, E. E. "Mysterium Iniquitatis, Das heilige Geheimnis der Sünde," Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel 19 (1963) 113-125.

Schwantes, H. Schöpfung der Endzeit, Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Auferweckung bei Paulus. (Arbeiten zur Theologie I Reihe, H. 12) Stuttgart 1963.

Sirand, L. "La Parousie de l'Antechrist, II Thess. 2:3-9," in Studia Paulina Congressus. (1961, II, 89-100) Rome 1963.

Spicq, C. "Les Thessaloniciens 'inquiets' étaient-ils des paresseux?" Studia Theologica 10 (1956) 1-13.

Staab, K. Die Thessalonicherbriefe. (Regensburger Neues Testament, VII, Paulusbriefe II, ed. A. Wikenhauser, 3, Auf.) Regensburg 1959.

Stanley, D. M. "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus," CBQ 23 (1961) 26-39.

Stempvoort, P. A. "Eine stilistische Lösung einer alten Schwierigkeit in I Thess. 5:23," NTS 7 (1960/1) 264-5.

Stepień, J. "Pawlowy charakter nauki dogmatycznej i moralnej listów do Tessaloniczan," Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny 13 (1960) 243-268.

_____. "Problem wzajemnego stosunku litérackiego listow do Tessaloniczan i próby jego rozwiazania," Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczay 13 (1960) 414-435.

Suggs, M. J. "Concerning the Date of Paul's Macedonian Ministry," Novum Testamentum 4 (1960/1) 60-68.

Thieme, K. "Die Struktur des ersten Thess.," in Abraham unser Vater, ed. O. Betz, M. Hengel, P. Schmidt. Leiden 1963.

Unger, M. F. "Historical Research and the Church at Thess.," Bibliotheca Sacra 119 (1962) 38-44.

Unnik, W. C. "Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv der altchristlichen Paränese," ZNW 26 (1960) 221-34.

Walvoord, J. F. "1. The Future Work of Christ. The Coming of Christ for His Church." Bibliotheca Sacra 123 (1966) 3-14.

Wimmer, A. "Trostworte des Apostles Paulus an Hinterbliebene in Thessalonich," Biblica 36 (1955) 273-86.

Wuest, K. S. "The Rapture - Precisely When?" Bibliotheca Sacra 114 (1957) 60-69.